
THE
Speculum Ecclesiasticum,
CONSIDERED.

IMPRIMATUR,

Hic Liber cui Titulus, [The *Speculum Ecclesiasticum*, &c.
Considered, &c.]

Nov. 16, 1687.

Hen. Maurice R^{mo}, in Christo
P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep.
Cant. a Sacris.

THE
PAMPHLET
ENTITLED,
Speculum Ecclesiasticum,
OR AN
ECCLESIASTICAL PROSPECTIVE - GLASS,
CONSIDERED,
In its Falſe
REASONINGS
AND
QUOTATIONS.

There are added, by way of Preface, Two further Answers,
the *First* to the Defender of the *Speculum*, the *Second*
to the Half-sheet againſt the *Six Conferences*.

L O N D O N:

Printed for **Ric. Chilwell**, at the *Rose and Crown* in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDC LXXXVIII.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED

NOV 10 1955

1955

1955

1955

1955

1955

1955

Nov. 14. 87.

To Mr. A. B. &c.

SIR,

MANY days have not pass'd since I took notice to you of the Spurious Authors in the Speculum used by Mr. Pulton in our late Noisy Conference; I desired you then to make further Remarks upon that Paper, not so much with respect to the Author (with whom I will not be concern'd) but to the Jesuit who used the Pamphlet, and by using it, and offering to subscribe it, made it his own.

The Author (they say) was in the way of being bred a Scholar in Cambridg, but he is now a Military Man; it is not decent in me to take notice of him, nor very proper for you who command so much good Learning, and have daily better Books under your Consideration; but seeing you are a Young Man, and not of years enough to be a Priest, Reflections upon his Paper will become you a little better than they would me. I understand that you have made some Notes already, and now I must give you the trouble of making more; for I have (by a very strange Providence of God) received a full and faithful Account of the Papers he fitted for the Press in defence of his Quotations; Quotations which cannot be otherwise defended than the Person in Story defended the Ship, who when his hands were cut off, kept his hold by his Teeth; for being not able to make a better Reply, he has treated our Church,
and

and our Religion, and my self as a Church of England Divine, with that roughness and incivility which usually proceeds from men of the most unpolished Manners. I know not in any Profession better Men than I have met with amongst the Soldiery; but this Man who is turned from Black to Red, is the first of that Order who has been rude to me: VICIOUS MAN, PROUD, HERETICK, WOLF, MAN OF GENEVA, are his usual Complements: I know you will not make him such returns; nor further concern your self, than as he offereth bad Testimonies, and a worse Vindication of them. I leave it to you, and hope that I need not give you fresh Assurances of my being, what I am,

SIR,

Your Faithful Friend,

THO. TENISON.

To

To the Reverend Dr. Tho. Tenison.

Honoured Sir,

I HAVE perused the Account of the Soldiers Papers, or Defence of his *Speculum*, which you were pleased to communicate to me ; and find his Defence to be a continued Series of imbittered railings and foolish reasonings blended together in an affected and illiterate stile. Such Bravadoes would deserve no consideration, much less any serious Answer, if the clamours and confidence of our Adversaries did not require it, and every Pamphlet unanswered, were not by an unwary sort of men esteemed unanswerable. However such labours we esteem not grievous, and are ever ready to discover the sophisms and falsity of the most impertinent Paper, if Truth may thereby receive any advantage, and the more unlearned Catholicks of the Church of *England* be preserved from Error and Illusion. We cannot hope any conviction of such an Adversary as this, who seems to have laid aside all considerations of Moral, as well as Christian Religion ; and in writing this Pamphlet, not so much to have sought the finding out of Truth, as to have gratified a most violent desire of revenge: Certainly such calumnies and railings, such passionate and vehement aspersions, argue not a Christian and Religious temper of mind, and may justly induce us to suspect, that if the Church of *Rome*

hath

hath degenerated from the more pure Christianity, some of the more zealous Sectaries of that Church have departed from Christianity it self. Such strange and imbitter'd Calumnies were never used by the Heathen Persecutors against the ancient Christians, and may alone suffice to refute all the Arguments and Reasons of our Adversary: Since Truth needs not the assistance of such exorbitancies; and that Spirit of God, which leadeth into all Truth, is the professed Enemy of them, and so cannot be supposed to accompany them.

As for what peculiarly concerns the *Speculum*, and may oppose my Reflections on it (for I intend to meddle with no more) it is so weak and trifling, so inconclusive and irrational, that I might supersede all farther labour, and remit the meanest Reader to my former Reflections upon the *Speculum*: If your commands and a scrupulous care for the concerns of Truth did not oblige me to make some Animadversions upon this Defence of the *Speculum*. To pass by then his frequent digressions, extraneous Controversies, Personal Accusations, and general Calumnies against all the Reformers and Reformed Churches, which you may please to consider, whether they deserve an Answer from a more Learned Pen: I will insist only upon what strictly concerns the *Speculum*. And first I may observe the strange ignorance and confidence of this man, how devoid of all knowledge of Antiquity, and unacquainted with the rules and methods of arguing received among all Learned men, who thinks it enough to oppose the authority of *Binius*, *Coccinus*, or some other Writer of his Party, to the many and unanswerable Arguments produced by you, against some Writings of the Ancients alledged in the *Speculum*, particularly

Mr. A. B's Answer to Dr. T's Letter.

9

cularly against the Books of St. *Ambrose*, *De Sacramentis*. As if we were now inquiring the opinion of *Binius*, and not the truth of things; or that we would forego plain and manifest Arguments, for the Authority of some Zealot of the Church of *Rome*. If indeed we maintained these Books to be spurious merely upon the Authority of some Reformed Criticks, and could produce no arguments for our opinion, no Confession of Learned Adversaries in favour of it; This way of arguing might perhaps be allowed, and the Authority of those interested *Roman* Criticks might justly be produced. But we plead not the sole Authority of our own Divines, but the merits of the cause, the reason of things, and evidence of Arguments. To which if we add the Confession of the more sincere and learned *Romanists*, a Confession which could be extorted by nothing else but the force of Truth, the Controversy will be put past all Dispute: And to oppose the Authority of some few Popish Criticks, will be not only unreasonable, but ridiculous. This I am well assured of, that the Reader will find no Writing cited by the *Speculum* under the name of any Ancient, rejected by me as spurious, but upon Arguments oft-times unanswerable, but always highly probable: To which the Confession of some learned *Romanists* is for the most part adjoined.

But to proceed to a particular consideration of what our Author offers in Defence of his *Speculum*, I will follow his Order, and begin with the Books of St. *Ambrose*, *De Sacramentis*. These Sir, you had in your Account of the Conference with the Jesuit, fully proved not to be the genuin Work of that Father; and therefore in considering the *Spe-*

B

culum

culum, I contented my self to say little to it. This our Author undertakes to defend, but instead of answering your Arguments, and those of Cardinal *Bona*, cited by you, produceth the Authority of *Bellarmin* and *Possevin*; urgeth indeed a weak Argument in the words of *Possevin*; but which might equally serve all the confessedly spurious Writings of the Ancients. As that it was Eight hundred years since, cited under the name of *St. Ambrose*, by *Lanfranc*, *Guilmud*, and others. For most of those numerous forgeries obtruded upon the World under the names of *St. Cyprian*, *Hierom*, *Augustin*, and other great men, which are on all hands allow'd to be spurious, were writ before these times, and so easily impos'd upon latter Writers, who had neither those opportunities, nor that skill to discern the spurious and genuine Works of the Ancients, which the present Age enjoys. As for *Possevin's* other argument, that these Books are of a like Stile with those, *De initiandis Mysteriis*, it is wholly false in the judgment of Cardinal *Bona*, a far more accurate and learned Writer. Certainly, in the last, the old *Italick* Version; in the former, the *Vulgar* Version of the Scriptures, is used; although this Version was not compos'd and published till some years after *St. Ambrose's* death. *Bellarmin* offers nothing in defence of this Work, but only reckoning up all the Writings of *St. Ambrose*, according to the printed Editions, giveth to this a place among them.

I come next to the Third Epistle of Pope *Anacletus*; which our Author defends with such an Argument as plainly discovers a most palpable and deplorable ignorance; as that the First and Second Epistles, and the Decrees of *Anacletus* might with equal reason be rejected, as
if

to Dr. Tenison's Letter

II

if they were not all equally, and upon the same account rejected by all Learned men of both Communions. What follows, manifests a no less gross ignorance of History, That there is as good authority to prove they are all genuin, as that there ever was such a man as *Anacletus*. For all Historians and Writers of all Ages, who give us a Catalogue of the Popes of *Rome*, fail not to number *Anacletus* among them: but no one makes any mention of his Decretal Epistles before the end of the Ninth Age. Our Author for a farther proof of this matter, refers us to *Binius*. But his Argument is no less unsatisfactory, amounting to no more than this, (a) that an ancient Manuscript Copy of the *Liber Pontificalis*, affirms *Anacletus* to have writ Two Decretal Epistles: Since this *Liber Pontificalis* is at most no older than the Ninth Age, and consequently of no better authority than the Epistles themselves. Not to say, That this passage, if true, plainly excludes the Third Epistle defended by our Author; a manifest Argument, that he either never himself consulted *Binius*, or that he is not so quick-sighted, as he would seem to be.

(a) Concil.
Tom. i. p. 519.

The *Arabick* Canons of the Council of *Nice*, we have sufficiently proved to be spurious by several Arguments, to which we may add their frequent mention of Patriarchs, a term unknown to the Church till the end of the Fourth Age. Our Author defends them by the authority of *Turrian*, *Alph. Pisanus*, *Coccinus*, and *Gualterus*. Their judgment we allow not; their Arguments we will consider. They arise to this; That the *African* Bishops would never have sent into the East, for a Copy of the *Nicene* Canons, if they had not been assured, that more Canons had been made, than those XX. which they had already: And that St.

Athanasius in his Epistle to Pope *Marcus*, affirms Eighty Canons to have been enacted in the Council. As for the last, that Epistle is an evident forgery of latter times, (most probably of *Ishdore Mercator*) as all Criticks of the Church of *Rome* allow, not one exempted: And then for the Case of the *African* Bishops, it is notorious that they sent into the East, not upon the imaginary hopes of receiving any more Canons, than those they had already, but only to deliver themselves from the vexatious Usurpations of the Bishops of *Rome*, pretending that a larger power had been given to them by the Council, than the vulgar Copies of the Canons of it did insinuate.

It will not be amiss for the similitude of the Argument to consider in the next place, what he offers in defence of the Book *De Cæna Domini*, published under *St. Cyprian's* name; our Author at first seems to allow this to have been spurious; but then repenting of his Concession, by a note annexed endeavours to defend it, but with such arguments as would equally serve all the spurious Writings of the Ancients: As that we have it delivered to us in *St. Cyprian's* name; for any thing we certainly know, ever since his days, therefore not certain, but from his own hand: That there is nothing in it contrary to the Doctrine of God's Holy Church; Lastly, That we cannot tell who besides *Cyprian* was the true Author of it, or who first intruded it into the World. Now take any of the confessedly spurious Writings of the Fathers, for example the Treatises *De duplici Martyrio*, and *De Dispositione Cænæ*, commonly ascribed to *St. Cyprian*, which no man in his right wits can deny to be supposititious. All these arguments may equally be accommodated

modated to them, nay with much greater Reason, since the true Author of these cannot be assigned, whereas the Author of the Book *de Cæna Domini* is most certainly known, as may be seen in the following Papers; and herein our Author is most unhappy in chusing to make his challenge (as he doth) chiefly in respect of this Book, whose Author is more clearly known than that of any other spurious Writing of the Ancients whatsoever. I cannot but wonder this confident and learned man should at last allow himself to have mistaken in citing St. Cyril for St. Hierom: but then this Confession solves not all the difficulties of that passage, as he vainly imagines; and clearly proves that he consulted not himself those Fathers whom he citeth, but only took them up at the second hand.

There remains only the Controversie of the Precedence of Pope *Sylvester* in the Council of *Nice*, of Pope *Leo* in that of *Chalcedon*, and *Vigilius* in the Second of *Constantinople*; wherein our Author doth most warmly engage, and employeth all the force of his Reading and Learning. Here before I refute the mistakes and falsities of our Author, I will observe, That if we should grant all this, it would bring neither any advantage to the Church of *Rome*, nor prejudice to the Church of *England*; for in the Ancient Councils, the Precedence of any Bishop included not any such Power, as the Pope hath in latter *Western* Councils claimed and exercised: In the Ancient Councils every Bishop had leave to propose whatsoever he thought fit, and the denial of that Liberty was ever thought to render all the Acts of any Council null and unlawful; whereas in the Council of *Trent* nothing was permitted to be spoken, no matter to be discussed, which was not first

al-

allowed by the President. Again, in latter Ages the Pope pretends no Council is valid, until confirmed by him; whereas in the Ancient Church the confirmation of the President, whosoever he was, much less always of the Bishop of *Rome*, was not esteemed necessary: Besides in Ancient Councils a great difference is to be made between the President of the Council, or him who moderated the Disputations, and directed the external Ceremonies of it, and him who presided or obtained the first place among the Bishops; for the first was a matter of Office and Authority, the latter only of Title and Dignity: Thus in the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Anatolius*, *Palladius*, &c. Commissioners of the Emperor *Marcian*, were Presidents and Moderators of the Council, as appeareth from all the Acts of it; altho Pope *Leo* by his Legates presided among the Bishops; indeed after the Rights of the several Patriarchs were settled, this precedency of place was ever given to the Pope or his Legates, if present, because his See was the chief City of the Empire; but then this precedency included a meer priority of place; no superiority of Power: If the Pope were not present either by himself or his Legates, and the matter to be determined admitted no delay, they acted without his Knowledg, as in the First Council of *Constantinople*; if he were present, and refused to assist in the Council, they acted even against his will, as in the Second Council of *Constantinople*; if present and assisting he obstinately opposed any action of the Council, and even protested against it, they over-ruled his protestation, as in the Council of *Chalcedon*. Thus the precedency of the Pope, when granted, was a matter of meer Ceremony, infinitely different from the Opinions and Pretensions of latter Ages; a thing indifferent, and which

which we should willingly allow to the Pope; if the present state of Christendom admitted the calling of a truly General Council.

To consider then the several cases before mentioned, I shall weigh the Arguments produced by our Author out of *Binius*, giving no deference to the bare authority of *Binius*, which our Adversary ever placeth in the front of his arguments, telling us that *Binius* says so over and over again; yet ever ready to yield to his Arguments, if they be found valid. I begin with *Sylvester*, and that our Author may not be deluded any longer by vain hopes, affirm, that Pope *Sylvester* presided not in the Council of *Nice*, either by himself, or by his Legates; and that *Hofius* acted not in the quality of *Sylvester's* Legate; a Position which this Gentleman vainly imagineth we dare not undertake to maintain. This is a matter of fact: to find out the truth of which, we are to consult, not the testimony of *Binius*, or opinion of latter Authors, but the ancient Records and Monuments of the Church, the Acts of the Council, and Historians of those times. All these testify that *Hofius*, not *Sylvester*, or his Legates, presided over the Council; and the pretence of *Hofius* his acting in the quality of *Sylvester's* Legate, is so frivolous, that it might with equal shew of truth be applied to the meanest Bishop in the Christian Church. As for our Author's reason of a greater probability, that the Bishop of the chief City of the world should preside, than the Bishop of the inconsiderable Town of *Corduba*, it is of no weight when opposed to so many and so great authorities attesting a matter of fact; and is of no validity, but in case of equal circumstances, which here cannot be had. For *Hofius* had acquired to himself an infinite veneration both in the Eastern and Western Church, intirely gain-
ed

(a) Concil.
Tom. II. p. 58.

ed the favour of the Emperor *Constantine*, and had been before employed by him to call a Council at *Alexandria*, and compose the controverſie about *Arius*, for the deciſion of which the Council of *Nice* was held. The Synodical Epiſtle of the Council to *Sylveſter*, reſented at large by our Author, is moſt certainly ſuppoſitious, and ſo adjudged by *Labbe* and *Coffart* in their late Edition: (a) of the Councils. Our Author refers us to *Binius*, and ſays he undeniably proves this matter from the authority of *Socrates*, L. I. c. 9. *Sozom.* L. I. c. 16. *Ruffinus*, L. I. c. 1. *Photius*, *Epiſt. ad Michael.* cap. 1. and the Acts of the Sixth General Council, Act. 18. The two firſt ſpeak not one word of the Preſidence of the Pope in the Council, but only that himſelf was abſent, and his Legates *Vitus* and *Vincentius* preſent. Where omitting *Hofius*, the chief Legate of the Pope in the opinion of *Binius* and our Author, while they pretend to acquaint us with the names of the Legates, they plainly intimate that *Hofius* was no Legate. *Ruffinus* ſaith no more than that the Emperor called the Council, *ex Sacerdotum Sententia*, by the advice of the Biſhops, which no more reſpects the Pope than any other Biſhop of the Church whatſoever; and moſt probably is to be referred to thoſe Eaſtern Biſhops only, which were then about the Emperor. *Photius* reckoning up the chief Biſhops of the Council, ranks in the firſt place *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and then the Popes, whom he ſaith to have been preſent by their Legates, *Vitus*, *Vincentius*, and *Hofius*. But firſt this teſtimony is rather prejudicial to our Author ſince it plainly makes *Alexander* Preſident of the Council; and then *Photius* lived too long after the Council to invalidate by his teſtimony the authority of ſo many Hiſtorians contemporary to the Council; eſpecially ſince

since he hath committed a gross mistake in this very matter. For he affirmeth the Council to have been held under the Popedom of *Sylvester* and *Julius*, the first of which sent *Vitus*, the second *Vincentius*, as their Legates to it; whereas *Julius* obtained not the Popedom till eleven years after the Council of *Nice* was ended. In the Acts indeed of the Fourth General Council, *Constantine* and *Sylvester* are said to have called the Council of *Nice*; but we are not now enquiring who called, but who presided over the Council of *Nice*. Besides, if either our subject required it, or our intended brevity permitted it, it might be fully proved from greater and more ancient Authorities, that this testimony also is erroneous, and that *Sylvester* had no hand in calling the Council. I chouse rather to observe the unpardonable oscitancy and ignorance of our Author, who citeth the opinion and affirmation of *Binius* (a), as the very words of the Fourth Council, whose Acts *Binius* had only referred to in the Margent for confirmation of his Position, although to no purpose. Lastly, that *Hofius* presided not over the Council in quality of the Popes Legate, besides the reasons above mentioned, is confessed by *Fr. Bivarius* (b), *Didacus Valdesius* (c), and *Johannes Salazar*; the first of which fully examines the matter, and largely proveth the truth of his assertion.

(a) Hist. Conc.
Nic. Concil.
Tom. 11. p. 3.

(b) Comm. in
Dextr. Chron.
p. 376.

(c) Apud eund.
Ibid.

The Presidence of Pope *Leo* in the Council of *Chalcedon*, is next to be considered; and here we deny not that his Legates sat before all the other Bishops, gave their Vote in the first place, and subscribed before all others. But then this was no other than a matter of Honour and Title; the Direction of Actions, and Moderation of Disputes in the Council, was managed by the Emperors Commissioners. And therefore, when

ΟΙ ΔΥΤΙΑΙ-
 ΖΟΥΤΕΣ ΕΙΣ
 ΡΩΜΗΝ ΔΕ ΤΑΛ-
 ΘΟΥΣ. Conc.
 Tom. IV. p.
 360.

the Legates of *Rome* obstinately contended, that the Circular Epistle of Pope *Leo* should be subscribed by all the Bishops of the Council; the Fathers unanimously opposed it, crying out that nothing should be subscribed, but the Definitions of the Council; and that if any disliked these their Proceedings, they might get them gone to *Rome*. To which may be added, that all the Canons of this Council were made not only without the Knowledg, but against the Protestation of the Legates. Whereas, had themselves presided in a strict and proper Sense, neither could have any Canons been formed in their Absence, nor could their Protections have been over-ruled. The Epistle of Pope *Leo* to the Council, cited by our Author, intimates no more than this Honorary Priority of his Place, which his Legates should enjoy in his stead; and the pronouncing of Sentence against *Dioscorus* by the Legates, proves no more: For all the Bishops in Order, pronounced Sentence against him, and condemned him every one in their own names; so, that if, for that Reason, the Legates presided. every Bishop of the Council may be said to have presided also. Nor doth the Synodical Epistle of the Council to Pope *Leo*, necessarily imply any thing beyond the Execution of this Priority of Place, performed by his Legates: Upon the account of which they metaphorically stile him a Head, presiding over the Members; a Title which might have been given to the *Princeps Senatus* among the *Romans*, altho that dignity carried not the least Authority along with it.

That Pope *Vigilius* presided over the Council of *Constantinople*, he wonders we are not ashamed to deny; and for Confirmation of this bold Assertion, appeals to the Acts of that Council. If he had ever read those

those Acts, he might justly be ashamed to affirm that supposed Presidence; and this I doubt not the Reader will be convinced of, if he peruseth that short account drawn from the Acts of the Council, which he will find in the following Papers. In the mean while to urge *Binius* his Authority, is but a repeated Crambe, which we before rejected, and cannot now approve. Our Author indeed citeth from *Binius* the words of *Eutychius*, *Patriarch of Constantinople, in his Epistle to *Vigilius*, wherein he desires him to be present in the Council, that so the Controversy then in Agitation might be determined, *Præsidente nobis vestra beatitudine; your Holiness presiding over us*. But first, this proves not that *Vigilius* actually did preside; but only that he might have presided, if his own obstinacy had not hindered it. Nay, further, it proves not that *Vigilius* had any peculiar right of presiding. For *Vigilius* a little before the Council writing to *Eutychius*, pretends that he also desired a Council might be called, and then useth the very same Complement to him, * *Ut* Concil. Tom V. p. 424. *finis tandem imponatur quæstioni, præsidente nobis vestra beatitudine; That at last an end may be put to the Controversy, your Holiness presiding over us*. As for the Authority of *Zonaras*, it is of no consideration, when opposed to the Acts of the Council, and all the Historians and Writers of those times. Not to say, that the words of *Zonaras* may be understood of all those Bishops, who either were present in the Council, or afterwards by their Subscriptions ratified the Decrees of it; in which sense his words will be literally true. For *Vigilius* was the chief all those Bishops. And the Historian giving us the History of the Council in two Lines, cannot be supposed to have observed any accuracy in it.

Mr. A. B's Answer

These are the only Arguments, Reasons and Authorities which our Author offers in Defence of his *Speculum*. We have shewn them all to be frivolous and inconclusive ; and thereby manifested the justice of our charge against the *Speculum*, and the impertinence of this Defence at the same time. Whether our Author hath in either, given sufficient proof of that great learning which he so much boasts of, I leave it to others to judg. But certainly in this Defence he hath more deeply wounded, instead of repairing, his reputation. For to pass by his Romantick stile, and virulent calumnies, his weak reasonings, and trifling arguments ; he hath in this Defence cited as genuine, a more evident and notorious forgery, than any one in the *Speculum* whatsoever ; I mean the Donation of *Constantine*, to believe which, is alone a sufficient argument of a gross ignorance, and want of learning. Yet this our Author allows, when speaking of the dignity of the City of *Rome*, he says it was the Seat of the Empire, till given by *Constantine* to Pope *Sylvester*. If our Author should brand all the disbelievers of this Donation, as he doth the deniers of his other admired forgeries, with the title of new fangled Hereticks : I fear he would condemn all the learned men of his own Church as well before as after the Reformation.

Thus, Sir, I have satisfied your commands, and once more discovered the Errors and Illusions of this Author. Whether the remaining part of his roving Pamphlet bent against the Reformed Church, and her Divines in general, and your self in particular, may deserve any Answer, I will not now enquire ; since ridiculous calumnies and aspersions become no otherwise considerable, than by their opposition. I only observe, that the Church.

Church of *Rome* hath no other way of retrieving the credit, and renewing among us the belief of her Errors, invented and intruded in former ages, than by introducing once more the deplorable ignorance of those times, and thereby preparing the way to the reception of forgeries and impostures. Such ignorance alone can establish these Errors in the minds of men; which can gain no admittance while Learning is cultivated, and the knowledge of Antiquity retained. So that we may reasonably conclude, the Reformed Religion will flourish, while Learning shall exist; And may both continue, till time shall have an end.

I am,

S I R,

Your Humble Servant,

A. B.

A S

AS soon as I had finished these Papers, I received a short Pamphlet of Half a Sheet, wherein the Author pretends in a few lines to Enervate all the Arguments, and solve the Objections brought against *Transubstantiation* in the *Six Conferences* published by Dr. Tenison. In so short a Refutation we might justly expect some strange and undeniable Demonstration; but in truth can scarce discover Reason: For to pass by his Flourishes in the beginning, and threats in the end, the Sum of this whole Paper may be referred to these Three Arguments: First, That *Abraham's* Senses were no less deceived in supposing he saw an Angel, when his Senses assured him it was a man, than ours are in the matter of *Transubstantiation*, and yet we are obliged to believe the former: That altho our Senses deceive us in their report of the Eucharist, yet it cannot be thence concluded they may deceive us in every thing else, but only in things which have the same Circumstances, which Circumstances are, that here intervenes a Proof more prevalent (Divine Revelation) which is of a far greater force than either Sense or Reason. Thirdly, That every Infidel to be converted, will acknowledg one God, Infinite in Perfection, and therefore seeing Truths which we cannot understand; that he can reveal these Truths, otherwise his Power would be limited; and that he can oblige his Creatures to believe them, otherwise his Authority would be not Infinite.

To

To the First I answer, That *Abrahams* Senses were not not at all deceived in making their report, when an Angel appeared in the shape of a man ; for nothing but bodies are the Objects of Sense, which discerneth the diversity of those bodies by the several impressions which they receive from them; if then *Abraham's* senses after all possible trial, assured him, that was the body of a man (or a human body) which was before him, they were not deceived ; it was most certainly a human body, and possessed both the Substance and Accidents of it ; whether that body was actuated with an assistant Angel, or an united soul, was not to be determined from the report of the senses (for immaterial Beings, such as Angels and Souls, are not the Objects of them) but from other Arguments. The second Argument is frivolous. For first, If certain objects of our Sense can have such circumstances as that the Senses must unavoidably be deceived in the report which they make of them ; and whether they have such circumstances can be known only by Divine Revelation ; which Divine Revelation is supposed to intervene only in the case of *Transubstantiation* : There may be infinite other cases, wherein other bodies also may no less illude the Senses, although God hath not thought fit to reveal them to us : And consequently, the report of our Senses must in all cases be uncertain. But then here are no such circumstances, as our Author imagins, I mean a proof more prevalent, and of far greater force than either sense or reason. For Divine Revelation is no such proof. For that such a Revelation was made, we know only from the report of others ; and therefore have no more than a Moral evidence of it : Whereas that the Consecrated Elements are yet Bread and Wine, we are assured.

fured not only from the report of others consulting their Senses, and consequently by an equal Moral Evidence ; but also (which is far greater Authority) by the experience and testimony of our own Senses. Thirdly, Although God be infinite, and therefore sees Truths which we cannot understand : Yet he cannot see those to be truths, which we must necessarily conclude to be contradictions, if we judg according to the first principles of Nature, and dictates of Reason. Otherwise either God must be an Irrational being ; or he must have created us in such a state, wherein although acting according to our Reason, we must necessarily judg true to be false, even in matters which are the proper objects of our Reason, such as are the natures and properties of all sensible bodies. Or if we should grant God can see these apparent contradictions to be truths, yet he cannot reveal them to us with an obligation of Belief, unless he first changeth our Nature, and giveth us such a Soul as may form quite different Notions of things from our present conceptions. As for our Adversaries argument, That otherwise the Power of God would be limited, and his Authority become finite ; it is wholly vain. For all will grant that the Authority of God suffereth no diminution by his inability to perform an unjust act ; such as would be to oblige men to believe a Proposition, which, if they act according to that nature and reason which he hath given them, they must necessarily reject, at least cannot admit.

Mem. That the *Speculum* is printed according to the Copy Bought of the Woman in the *Savoy*, to whom Mr. *Pulson* directed.

SPECULUM ECCLESIASTICUM,

OR, AN

Ecclesiastical Prospective-Glass,

WHEREIN

May be clearly seen the *Doctrine* of the *Primitive Church* for the first five hundred years after our Saviour; especially as to the chiefest Points in debate between *Protestants* and *Roman Catholics*, viz. The Visible and Continued *Succession* of the *Church*: That the *Pope*, or *Bishop of Rome* is the *true Successor* of *St. Peter*, and *Supreme Head* of the *Universal Church*: The *Churches Infallibility*: And its *Unity*: And also the *Real Presence* of the *Body and Blood* of *Christ* in the *Blessed Sacrament*: *Auricular Confession* and *Absolution*: *Invocation* and *Prayer* to *Saints*: *Purgatory* and *Prayer* for the *Dead*. And lastly, That *Apostolical Tradition* is the *true Rule of Faith*. All which is plainly prov'd, both by *Holy Scripture*, and the undeniable *Testimony* of *Primitive Fathers*, in the first 500 years.

During which time, the *Church* is by the Consent of the chiefest leading *Protestants* acknowledg'd to be in its Purity, as *Mr. Fulk* in his *Confut. of Purgatory*, p. 373. saith, *That the Church of Rome in the time of Cyprian, Tertullian, Augustine, Jerom, as it was founded by the Apostles, so it continued in the Doctrine of the Apostles.* *Mr. Reynolds* in his *Confer.* with *Mr. Hart*, p. 443. *That the Succession of the Roman Bishops was a Proof of the true Faith in the time of Augustin, Epiph. Opat. &c.* And *Calvin* in his *Institut.* l.4.c.2.Sect.2. where he says, *That it was a matter out of all doubt, that from the Beginning, even until the time of Tertullian, Origen, Augustin, nothing was changed in Doctrine.* And again, in his *Institut.* in French, printed at Geneva, by *Conrad. Badius*, An.1562. he says, *It was a thing notorious, and without doubt, that after the Apostles Age, until those times of (Augustine, &c.) no change was made in Doctrine, neither at Rome, nor at other Cities*

D

A con-

A continual Succession of the Bishops or Popes of Rome, from St. Peter to this present Pope Innocent the XI.

S. Peter.	69	S. Leo Mag.	461	Johannes. VII.	707	Benedictus. V.	965
S. Linus.	80	S. Hillarius.	467	Sisinnius.	708	Johannes. XIII.	972
S. Clerus.	93	S. Simplicius.	483	Constantinus.	714	Dominus. II	972
S. Clement.	102	S. Felix. III.	492	S. Gregorius. II.	731	Benedictus. VI	974
S. Anocletus.	112	S. Gelaus.	I. 496	S. Gregorius. III.	741	Benedictus. VII.	984
S. Evaristus.	121	S. Anastasius. II.	498	S. Zacharias.	752	Johannes. XIV.	985
S. Alexander I.	132	S. Symachus.	514	Stephanus. II.	752	Johannes. XV	996
S. Sixtus I.	142	S. Hornisda.	423	Stephanus. III.	757	Johannes. XVI.	996
S. Telephorus.	154	S. Johannes. I.	526	S. Paulus.	I. 767	Gregory. V.	999
S. Hyginus.	158	S. Felix. IV.	530	Stephanus.	IV. 772	Sylvester. II.	1003
S. Pius I.	167	Bonifacius. II.	531	Hadrianus.	I. 795	John. XVII	1003
S. Anicetus.	175	Johannes. II.	535	Leo.	III. 816	John. XVIII	1009
S. Soter.	179	S. Agapetus.	537	Stephanus.	V. 817	Sergius. IV.	1013
S. Eleutherius.	194	S. Silverius.	540	S. Pafcalis.	I. 824	Benedict. VIII.	1024
S. Victor I.	203	S. Vigilius.	555	Eugenius.	II. 827	Johannes. XIX.	1033
S. Zepherinus.	221	S. Pelagius. I.	559	Valentinus.	827	Benedict. IX.	1044
S. Calistus I.	226	S. Johannes. III.	572	Gregorius.	IV. 843	Gregorius. VI.	1046
S. Urbanus I.	233	S. Benedictus. I.	577	Sergius.	II. 847	Clement. II.	1047
S. Pontianus.	237	Pelagius.	590	S. Leo.	IV. 856	Damasus. II.	1048
S. Antherus.	238	S. Gregorius Magnus, under	604	Benedictus. III.	858	S. Leo. IX.	1054
S. Fabianus.	253	whom England		Nicolaus. I.	867	Victor. II.	1057
S. Cornelius.	255	was converted		Hadrianus. II.	872	Stephanus. X	1058
S. Lucius. I.	257	to the Christi-		Johannes. VIII.	882	Nicholaus. II.	1061
S. Stephanus I.	260	an Fairb.		Martinus. II.	884	Alexander. II.	1073
S. Sixtus. II.	261			Hadrianus. III.	885	S. Gregor. VII	1085
S. Dionysius.	272	Sabinianus.	605	Stephanus. VI.	891	Victor. III	1087
S. Felix.	275	S. Bonifacius. III.	606	Formosus.	896	Urbanus. II	1099
S. Eurychianus.	283	S. Bonifacius. IV.	614	Stephanus. VII.	900	Pafcalis. II	1118
S. Cajus.	296	S. Deusdedit.	617	Romanus. IX.	901	Gelasius. II	1119
S. Marcellinus.	304	S. Bonifacius. V.	625	Theodorus. II.	901	Calistus. II	1124
S. Marcellus.	309	Honorius. I.	638	Johannes. IX.	905	Honorius. II	1130
S. Eusebius.	311	Severinus.	639	Benedictus. IV.	907	Innocentius II.	1143
S. Miltiades.	313	Johannes. IV	641	Leo. V.	907	Celestinus. II.	1144
S. Silvester. I.	335	S. Theodorus. I	649	Christopherus.	908	Lucius. II.	1145
S. Marcus.	336	S. Martinus. I.	654	Sergius. III.	910	Eugenius. III.	1153
S. Julius.	I. 352	S. Eugenius. I.	655	Anastasius. III.	912	Anastasius. IV.	1154
S. Liberius.	358	S. Vitalianus.	669	Lando.	912	Adrianus. IV.	1159
S. Felix.	367	Adeodatus.	676	Johannes. X.	929	Alexander. III.	1181
S. Damasus.	384	Domnus.	678	Leo. VI.	929	Lucius. III.	1185
S. Siricius.	398	S. Agatho.	682	Stephanus. VIII.	931	Urbanus. III.	1187
S. Anastasius.	402	S. Leo. II.	684	Johannes. XI.	936	Gregorius. VIII.	1187
S. Innocentius.	417	S. Benedict. II.	685	Leo. VII.	939	Clemens. III.	1191
S. Zofimus.	418	S. Johannes. V.	686	Stephanus. IX.	946	Celestinus. III.	1198
S. Bonifacius.	423	Conon.	687	Martinus. III.	946	Innocent. III.	1216
S. Celestinus.	432	S. Sergius. I.	701	Agapetus.	II. 955	Honorius. III.	1227
S. Sixtus. III.	440	Johannes. VI.	705	Johannes. XII.	963	Gregorius. IX.	1241

Cælestinus.	IV. 1241	Gregorius.	XI. 1378	Julius.	III. 1555
Innocentius.	IV. 1254	Urbanus.	VI. 1389	Marcellus.	II. 1555
Alexander.	IV. 1260	Bonifacius.	VII. 1404	Paulus.	IV. 1559
Urbanus.	IV. 1264	Innocent.	VII. 1406	Pius.	IV. 1565
Clemens.	IV. 1268	Gregorius.	XII. 1409	Pius.	V. 1572
Gregorius.	X. 1276	Alexander.	V. 1410	Gregorius.	XIII. 1585
Innocentius.	V. 1276	Johannes.	XXII. 1415	Sixtus.	IX. 1590
Hadrianus.	V. 1276	Martinus.	V. 1431	Urbanus.	VII. 1590
Johannes.	XX. 1277	Eugenius.	IV. 1446	Gregorius.	XIV. 1591
Nicholaus.	III. 1280	Nicholaus.	V. 1455	Innocentius.	IX. 1592
Martinus.	IV. 1285	Calistus.	III. 1438	Clement.	VIII. 1605
Honorius.	IV. 1287	Pius.	II. 1454	Leo.	XI. 1605
Nicholaus.	IV. 1292	Paulus.	II. 1471	Paulus.	V. 1620
S. Cælestinus.	V. 1294	Sixtus.	IV. 1484	Gregorius.	XV. 1623
Bonifacius.	VI. 1303	Innocentius.	VIII. 1492	Urbanus.	VIII. 1644
Benedictus.	IX. 1304	Alexander.	VI. 1503	Innocentius.	X. 1654
Clemens.	V. 1314	Pius.	III. 1503	Alexander.	VII. 1667
Johannes.	XXI. 1334	Julius.	II. 1513	Clemens.	IX. 1670
Benedictus.	X. 1342	Leo.	X. 1522	Clemens.	X. 1676
Clemens.	VI. 1352	Adrianus.	VI. 1523	Innocentius.	XI. who
Innocentius.	VI. 1362	Clemens.	VII. 1534	now presides in the	
Urbanus.	V. 1370	Paulus.	III. 1549	Chair of S. Peter.	

The Churches continued Succession prov'd by Holy Scripture, and the Testimony of Holy Fathers.

AND first from *Holy Scripture*, Isa. 59. 21. My Spirit which is in thee, and my words which I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth; and out of the mouth of thy seed for ever. Isa. 60. 1, 3, 11. Arise, be illuminated, O Jerusalem, because thy light is come, &c. And the Gentiles shall walk in thy light: And thy Gates shall be open continually day and night, they shall not be shut that the strength of the Gentiles may be brought to thee, &c. Read Isa. 62. 6. Ezek. 37. 26. and Daniel 7. 13, 14.

Christ gave some *Apostles*, some *Prophets*, some *Evangelists*, some *Pastors*, some *Doctors*, to the consummation of the *Saints*, &c. Until we all meet in the Unity of Faith, &c. That now we be not Children wavering, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, Ephes. 4. 11, 12, 13, 14. Go ye, teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c. And behold, I am with you all days, even to the Consummation of the World, S. Matth. 28. 19, 20. And S. John the Evang. 14. 16. I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth. And S. Matth. 16. 18. Upon this Rock will I build my Church, and it shall continue to the worlds end, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.

From our
Saviour in
the year
100.

From our
Saviour to
the year

ST. Irenæus lib. 4. *adversus Hæres.* c. 43. where he saith, We are bound to obey those Priests, which have their Succession from the Apostles, as we have prov'd, who with the Succession of their Episcopal Charge, have, according to the Ordinance of God, received a sure Gift of Truth.

The same St. Irenæus in lib. 4. c. 45. Where is it then that a man shall find such Pastors, as St. Paul teacheth us, when he says, God hath placed in his Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Doctors, &c. There then, where the Gifts of our Lord are placed, must we seek for the Truth, amongst whom the Succession of the Church from the Apostles, and the Purity of Doctrine is maintain'd in its Integrity.

200.

And in lib. 3. c. 3. *adversus Hæres.* Seeing in such a Volume as this, it is too much to reckon up the Succession of all Churches, 'tis only declaring the Tradition of the Church of Rome the greatest, and most ancient, and most known of all others, &c. which she has received from the Apostles, and the Faith deliver'd and convey'd down to us by the Succession of Bishops: And we confound all such, who either through Self-love, Vain-glory, Blindness, Malice, or on any other account do unduly assemble.

TERtullian lib. *prescript.* c. 21. In Edit. Paris. 1580. p. 78. What the Apostles taught, I will prescribe ought no otherwise to be learned than by those Churches which the Apostles founded. And in c. 37. What I believe, I received from the present Church, the present Church from the primitive, that from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ.

S. Cyprian in Ep. sua ad Magnum, How can he be acknowledged for a true Pastor, who without succeeding to any one, begins from himself?

300.

Origen in *prescript.* lib. 1. Periarcho. So because there are many who persuade themselves they believe aright concerning Christ, and some of them teach differently from those that went before us, yet the Doctrine of the Church deliver'd down by the Order of Succession from the Apostles, and to this present remaining in the Churches, is preserv'd: That Truth alone is to be believ'd, which in nothing disagrees from Ecclesiastical Tradition. And in *Tract.* 29. Matth. We are not to believe otherwise than the Churches of God have successively delivered down to us.

ST. Gregorius Nyssenus lib. 3. pag. 126. *contra Eunomium.* And that no body be impertinently troublesome to me, by urging me to produce Reasons and Arguments for the maintaining such Points as by us are received as unquestionable. Let it be known that it is a sufficient Proof of Doctrine, that we have received it by Tradition from our Ancestors, it having been left us as a kind of Inheritance from the Apostles, and convey'd down to us by a continual succession of the Faithful in all Ages.

400.

St. Athanasius in *Decret. Synod. Nicen. contra Arianos*, saith, Behold, we have prov'd the succession of our Doctrine deliver'd by Hand to Hand, from Father to Son; but as for you, new Jews, and Children of Cainphas, what Progenitors can you shew for your Speeches?

S. Pacianus in Ep. sua 3. For my self, holding my self secure, upon the Succession of the Church, and contenting my self with the Peace of the ancient Congregation, I have not learn'd any studies of Discord.

S. Epiphanius in *Hæres.* 75. n. 8. writing against Arius, who deny'd Purgatory and praying for the Dead, saith, I do affirm the Church does necessarily maintain this, having received it from Antiquity; and can any one presume to make null the Command of his Mother, or overthrow the Law of his Father?

ST. Augustinus *contra Epistolam Manichei, quod Fundamentum vocatur*, saith, There are many things which holds me in the Church, &c. The Succession of Priests from the very Seat of Peter the Apostle, &c. to the present Bishoprick, holds me in the Church.

And lastly, the Name it self, *Carbolick*, which not without cause, this Church only a-^{From our} mongst so many *Heresies*, has obtain'd. Et in *Psalm. contra partem Dynati*. Reckon up *Saviour* to (saith he) the *Priests* even in the Chair of *Peter*, and in that List of *Fathers*, see the the *Tear* Order of *Succession*. That is the *Rock* against which the *Gates of Hell* shall never prevail. And the same *St. Aug.* in *Ep. ad Generosum, qua est 165.* considering the Order of *Bishops* succeeding one another, saith, For *Linus* succeeded *Peter*, &c. Then *Damasus*, to him succeeded *Siricius*, to him *Anastasius*. In this order of *Succession*, there's not one *Donatist Bishop* to be found. And also in *lib. 3. de Bapt. cont. Donat.* If the Church shall not continue here on earth, to the end of the World, to whom did our Lord say, *Behold, I am with you to the end of the World?*

500.

Optatus Melvitanus lib. 2. contra Par. reckons up the *Bishops of Rome* from *St. Peter* to *Siricius* then *Pope*, saying to the *Donatists*, Shew the original of your *Chair*, you who challenge the *Holy Church* to your selves. *Vincentius Lirin. in Admon. con. Hares.* c. 27. *Faith* is that which thou hast received, not that which thou hast devised, a thing not of private *Usurpation*, but of publick *Tradition*, whereof thou oughtest not to be the Author, but Conserver.

That the Pope or Bishop of Rome is the true Successor of St. Peter, and Supreme Head of the Church, prov'd by the Testimony of holy Fathers.

AND first from *Holy Scripture*; *S. Matth. 16. 18.* Thou art *Peter*, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and it shall continue to the Worlds end, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. *S. John Evangelist 21. 15, 16, 17.* where *Christ* saith to *St. Peter*, Feed my Lambs, feed my Lambs, feed my Sheep. *S. Luke the 22. 31.* I have prayed for thee, *Peter*, that thy Faith fail not; and thou being at length converted, confirm thy Brethren. And *St. Peter* is always reckon'd first in *Holy Scripture*: The Names of the Twelve are these; the first *Simon*, who is call'd *Peter*, &c. *S. Matth. 10. 2. S. Mark 3. S. Luke 6. and Acts the 1.*

1000.

S. Dionysius Areopag. in Divinorum Nominum c. 3. post med. calls *St. Peter*, *Supremum & Antiquissimum Theologorum fastigium*. The same *St. Dionys.* (as cited by *St. John Damascen Orat. 2. de dormit. Deipar. sub finem*) saith, That there was also present at the blessed Virgin *Mary's* Death, both *James* the Brother of our Lord, and *Peter* the supreme and most venerable top of *Divines* or *Apostles*.

S. Clemens Romanus in Epistola prima; *Simon Peter*, who for the reward of his true Faith, and the preaching of sound Doctrine, is defin'd to be the Foundation of the Church, for which reason he is also by the divine Mouth of our Lord, surnamed *Peter*, who was of our Lord's first Election, Chief of the Apostles, to whom as chief, God the Father hath revealed his Son, &c. And in *Ep. 2. init.* he calleth *St. Peter* the blessed Apostle, the Father of all the Apostles, who received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

S. Ignatius in Ep. ad Romanos, writeth to the sanctified and illuminated Church, which presideth in the Country of the Romans. *Qua presidet in loco regionis Romanorum.*

St. Anacletus in *Ep. 3.* near the beginning, saith, But indeed this most holy Roman and Apostolical Church, hath obtain'd the Supremacy, not from the Apostles, but from our Lord and Saviour himself; and hath received an Eminency of Power over all Churches, and the whole Flock of Christian People; even as he hath said to *St. Peter* the Apostle, Thou art *Peter*, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, &c.

2000.

From our
Saviour to
the Tear

St. Irenæus lib. 3. c. 3. All Churches round about ought to resort to the Roman Church, by reason of her more powerful Principality. *Ex iterum lib. 3. contra Valent.* c. 3. The Roman Church is the greatest, and most ancient, founded at Rome by S. Peter and S. Paul.

S. Pius Papa in Ep. 1. ad Universos; saith thus of Jesu Christ: Who also hath ordain'd this holy Apostolick See to be the Head of all Churches, in saying to the Prince of the Apostles, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, &c. And I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

200. Tertullianus lib. de Pudicitia p. 1. n. 5. & c. 13 in 100, 101. where he styles the Roman Bishop, Pontifex Maximus, & Episcopus Episcoporum, & Benedictus Papa, & Apostolicus.

S. Theophilus Antiochenus lib. 2. Alegor. in Evang. Marci; The Synagogue is Mother-in-law to St. Peter, but the Church is his Daughter, whose Government Peter has received.

ST. Cyprianus Ep. 69. there Peter speaks upon whom the Church was built, teaching and shewing the Name of the Church, &c. Et Ep. 40. God is one (saith he) One Christ, One Church, and One Chair founded upon Peter by the Word of Christ. And in Ep. 73. Christ gave this Power first to Peter, upon whom he built the Church, and from whence he instituted and declared the Origin of Unity, &c. And in Ep. ad Julian. We hold Peter the Head and Root of the Church.

300. Origen in Homil. 5. in Exodum post med. Behold him, that great Foundation of the Church, and that most solid Rock upon which Christ hath founded his Church, &c. Et in lib. 5. explan. in Evang. Johan. ut refert Eusebius lib. 6. Hist. c. 19. Ed. Lat. Colon. 1581. saith, Peter, upon whom the Church of Christ is built, against which the Gates of Hell shall not prevail: And in Ep. Pauli ad Romanos c. 6. When the chief charge of feeding Christ's Sheep was given to St. Peter, and the Church founded upon him; there was requir'd of him the Confession of no Vertue, but of Charity.

S. Hippolitus Mart. in Oratione de Consummatione mundi; Peter the Prince, the Rock of Faith, whom Christ our God hath judged blessed, He the Doctor of the Church, the Chief of the Disciples; He who has the Keys of the Kingdom, has taught them saying, &c.

ST. Hieronymus lib. 1. advers. Pelag. c. 4. As Plato, says he, was Prince of the Philosophers, so was Peter of the Apostles, upon whom the Church of Christ was firmly built. Et lib. 1. advers. Jovinian p. 14. But you affirm, says he, that the Church is founded upon St. Peter; although in another place it is said to be built upon all the Apostles, and that all of them received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and have the Church establish'd equally upon them: Nevertheless One is chosen of the Twelve, to the end that a Head being appointed, all Schism may be cut off. And in Ep. 57. ad Damasum Papam, I speak, saith he, to the Successor of the Fisher-man, to the Disciple of the Cross. I follow no other Leader but Christ, I am in Communion with your Holiness, that is, with the Chair of Peter; upon that Rock I know the Church is built. Whosoever eats the Lamb out of this House, is profane. Whosoever is not in the Ark of Noah, shall perish in the Flood. Et in Ep. 8. ad Demetriadem c. 9. I think fit to admonish you with a pious and charitable Affection, That you hold fast the Faith of holy Innocentius the Successor in the Apostolical Chair, &c.

400.

St. Athanasius in Ep. ad Felicem; Thou art Peter, and upon thy Foundation the Pillars of the Church, that is, the Bishops, are fortified. St. Chrysostom. Hom. 55. in Matth. The Pastor and Head of the Church, was once a poor Fisher-man. St. Ambrose in 2 Cor. 12. Andrew first followed our Saviour, yet Andrew received not the Primacy, but Peter. S. Cyril. Hierus. Catech. 2. Peter the Prince, and most excellent of all the Apostles.

ST. *Augustinus* Ep. 86. Peter the Head of the Apostles, the Gate-keeper of Heaven; From our and the Foundation of the Church. And in *Tract. ult. in Johannem*; Of whom *Pe-* Saviour to ter the Apostle, by reason of the Primacy of his Apostleship bore the Person. And in the Year *Psaln* 108. *Petrus Ecclesia agnoscitur in figura gestasse personam, propter Primatum quem in Discipulis habuit.* And again,

St. Augustin in Ep. 157. *ad Optatum*, where he says, That he himself and the African Bishops went to *Casaria* to assemble in Council by express Command of the Pope; they came, says he, to *Casaria*, I being likewise present; whither we were oblig'd to go by the Command of venerable Pope *Zozimus*, Bishop of the See Apostolick.

Socrates lib. 2. Hist. Eccl. attests that the Synods of the Eastern Church were void, unless confirm'd by the Bishop of Rome. And in the same Book c. 11. he relates how *Julius* the Pope restor'd several Eastern Bishops to their Seats, who had been expell'd them by the *Arians*. At the same time, says he, (naming them) going to *Rome*, the head City of the World, gave *Julius* the Bishop of *Rome*, an account of their Condition. And he, because the Church of *Rome* had a Privilege above all others, took their parts, writing very sharp Letters to the Eastern Bishops. *Zozomen lib. 3. Hist. Eccl. c. 7.* gives the like account of these Bishops, and faith of the Bishop of *Rome*; Because for the Dignity of his See, the Care of all belonged to him; he restored them to their Diocesses again.

500.

The Churches Infallibility, prov'd by Scripture, and by the Testimony of Holy Fathers.

AND first by *Holy Scripture*, *Matth.* the 16. 18. The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, (the Church) *Luke* 10. 16. where *Christ* (speaking to his Apostles, and in them to his whole Church, saith, He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me. And *S. Matth.* 18. 17. He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen, and as a Publican. 1 Ep. *S. John* the 4. 6. He that knoweth God, heareth us; and he that heareth us not, is not of God; in this we know the Spirit of Truth, and the Spirit of Error. *S. Mark* 16. 15, 16. Go ye preach the Gospel to all Creatures, &c. He that believeth not, shall be condemned. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. The House of God, which is the Pillar and Ground of Truth. *S. John* 14. 16, 26. He will give you another *Paraclete* that he may abide with you for ever, &c. He shall teach you all things, and suggest to you all things whatsoever I shall say to you. And *S. John* 16. 13. He (the Holy Ghost) shall teach you all Truth, &c. *Matth.* 28. 20. *Luke* 1. 33. *Ephes.* 5. 27.

100.

And *Acts* 15. 28. The Apostles speaking in their Council held at *Jerusalem*, saith, It hath seem'd good to the Holy Ghost, and to us. *Vid.* *Dan.* 7. 13, 14. and *Ezek.* 37. 26, 27.

ST. *Irenaeus lib. 3. c. 40.* Where the Church is, there is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of God is, there is all Grace. And *lib. 4. c. 43.* We must believe those Priests who are in the Church, who have a Succession from the Apostles, who, together with Episcopal Power, have according to the good pleasure of the Father, received the certain Gift of Truth. And *cap. 62.* The Church shall be under no mans Judgment, for to the Church all things are known, in which is perfect Faith of the Father, and of all the Dispensation of Christ, and firm knowledge of the Holy Ghost, who teacheth all Truth.

200.

Tertullian lib. de Praes. advers. Haereticos cap. 28. Et in Edit. Paris. 1580. p. 28. What then! says he, have all the Churches err'd? Did the Holy Ghost take care of none to lead them into Truth, being for this very reason sent by Christ, being for this Intention

Intention

From our
Saviour to
the Year

Intention petition'd of the Father, that he might teach them all Truth? The warrant you the Steward of God, and Vicar of Christ, neglected his Duty, &c. And is it likely that so many, and such diffus'd Churches should err, and yet meet in one Faith?

S. Iraneus again l. 3. *advers. Hæres. c. 3.* saith That every one who will, may from the Church receive the Water of Life; for she is the Entrance into Life, &c.

300.

ST. Cyprianus Ep. 69. *ad Floren. Papiam.* Christ in the Gospel, saith he, when his Disciples went away from him, said to the Twelve, *What will you also depart?* Peter answered him, *Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal Life, &c.* Peter speaks there upon whom the Church was built, declaring in the name of the Church, that though great numbers of such stubborn and self-will'd People, as will not submit, become Deserters, yet the Church will never fall from Christ; which Church is the People united to the Priest, and the Flock following their Pastor. And in *lib. singulari de Unit. Ecclesiæ*, saith, The Spouse of Christ cannot become an Adulteress, she is *un-corrump* and pure; she knows but one House, and with a chaste Modesty secures the Sanctity of one Chamber. She it is that preserves us for Heaven, and gives to her Children which she has brought forth, the Inheritance of a Crown.

And in Ep. 55. To Peter's Chair, and the principal Church, Infidelity and false Faith cannot have Access.

And gain in *lib. de Unitate*; If it were possible for any to escape, who were not in the Ark of Noah, it shall be likewise possible for him to escape who is not in the Church.

ST. Victor Vicensis Episcopus in *lib. 2. de persecut. Wandolica*, S. Eugenium Episcopum *introducitur Obado regni proposito sic respondentem.* If the Authority of the King desire to know our Faith, which is One and True, let him send to his Friends, and I will write to my Brethren, that my Fellow-Bishops may come; who with you and us may shew our common Faith, and especially the Roman Church, which is the Head of all Churches.

400.

Laſtantiuſ Firmianuſ *lib. 3. ult.* It is only, says he, the Catholick Church that hath the true Worship of God, that is the Well-spring of Truth, the Dwelling-place of Faith.

S. Cyril Hierusal. *lib. 3. in Apolog. contra Ruffin. c. 4.* The Roman Faith, says he commended by the Apostles, cannot be changed.

Idem 5. Catech. For God requireth from you his words delivered you in trust.

S. Epiphan. in *Hæres. 55.* For bounds, saith he, are set to us, and Foundations and the building of Faith, and the Traditions of the Apostles and Holy Scriptures, and Succession of Doctrine, and on every side the Truth of God is fortified, and no body is deceived with new Fables.

500.

ST. Augustinus Enarat. 2. in *Psal. 101.* saith thus to those who will have the Church to fail, or be lost: But that Church which was spread through all Nations, now has no longer a Being, it is quite lost. This is the Cry of those who are not in the Church. O impudent Clamour! She is not, because you do not belong to her; see that you for that reason have not lost your Being: for she will have a Being, though you have none. Their abominable and cursed Calumny, full of Presumption and Deceit, void of Truth, Wisdom and Reason, idle, temerarious, rash, and pernicious; the Spirit of God foresaw when even as it were against them, he proclaim'd her Unity, *In assembling the People together in One, and Kings to serve our Lord.* And a little further saith in person of the Church, What is the reason that some, I know not who, going out from me, murmur against me? Why will the lost persons needs have me lost? For this is their Cry against me, that I was, but now I have no Being: Shew me the fewness of my days, &c. And he (our Saviour) has shewed me, neither was his Answer insignificant.

And

And who was it (that shewed me) but he that is the very Way? And what was the Information he gave me? Behold, I am with you to the end of the World. From our Saviour to the Tear
And in lib. 4. de Bap. cap. 4. I know by Divine Revelations, that the Spirit of Truth teacheth all Truth.

The Unity of the Church, out of which there can be no Hopes of Salvation, prov'd by Holy Scripture, and the Testimony of Holy Fathers.

AND first by *Holy Scripture*; S. John Evang. 10. 16. There shall be one Fold, and one Pastor. Job. 17. 11. Christ prayed that his Disciples might be One. 1 Corinth. Chap. 10. v. 17. We are one Bread, one Body, as many as partake of one Bread: And 1 Cor. 1. 10. I beseech you that you all speak one thing, and that there be no Schisms among you, but that you be perfect in one Sense, and one Knowledge. Acts 4. 32. The multitude of Believers had one Heart, one Soul. S. Matth. 18. 17. He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen and a Publican. 1 Ep. S. John the 4. 6. He that knoweth God, heareth us; and he that heareth us not, is not of God. And S. Mark 16. 16. He that believeth not, shall be condemned. Rom. 16. 17. Now I beseech you, Brethren, mark them which cause Divisions and Scandals amongst you, contrary to the Doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them; for such do not serve Christ our Lord, &c. Titus c. 3. v. 10, 11. A man that is an Heretick after the first and second Admonition, avoid; knowing that he that is such an one, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned by his own Judgment. Galat. 1. 8. But although we, or an Angel from Heaven evangelize to you besides that which we have evangeliz'd to you, be he Anathema.

100.

S. Irenaeus lib. 4. adv. Heres. c. 43. We are to obey those Priests who have their Succession from the Apostles, &c. (as above.) But for others, who are not in Communion with the principal Seat, in whatsoever place they hold their Meetings, we are to look on them, either as Hereticks, and Men of pernicious Doctrine, or as Schismaticks, full of Pride and Self-love, or as Hypocrites, &c. And all these are Enemies to Truth: And such as are Hereticks, who bring strange Fire to the Altar of God, that is, strange Doctrines, shall be consum'd with Fire from Heaven, like Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10.) &c.

260.

Idem ibid. c. 62. And he will judge those who make Schisms, who are abominable void of the love of God; and having more concern for their own convenience, than for the Unity of the Church, who for any inconsiderable Reasons, divide and break asunder the great and glorious Body of Christ, and endeavour as much as lies in them utterly to ruin it, having Peace in their Mouths, but working nothing but Destruction, truly straining at a Gnat, and swallowing a Camel: For whatsoever Evil they design to redress, it will be much less than the Evil of Schism. He will likewise judge all those who believe not the Truth; that is, such as are out of the Church: but he shall be judged by none.

S. Cyprianus in Ep. 69. The Church which is Catholick is one, without Separation or Division, closely knit together, and united by the Tie of the agreeing Priests.

Idem lib. de Unit. Eccl. Whosoever, says he, leaving the Church, cleaves to an Adulteress, is cut off from the Promises of the Church. He that falls from the Church of Christ, shall never come to the Rewards of Christ; he is an Alien, he's a profane Person, he's an Enemy: He cannot have God for his Father, who has not the Church

300.

From our
Saviour to
the Year
300.

for his Mother, &c. And he that gathers any where out of the Church, breaks in pieces the Church of Christ. Christ affirms, *I and my Father are one* (John 10.) And 'tis written of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *These three are one*. And can any one believe that this *Unity*, proceeding even from the *Unity* of God, and strengthen'd by the heavenly Sacraments, can be broken in the Church, and dissolv'd by disagreeing *Schismatics*? Whosoever does not preserve this *Unity*, contemns the Law of God, is without the Faith of the Father and the Son, and has neither Life nor Salvation in him.

Origen in *Præfat. in lib. Periarchon*. Let the Doctrine of the Church be kept which is deliver'd from the Apostles by Succession, and remains in the Church to this very day.

L Arianus Firmia, lib. 1. c. ult. It is only the Catholic Church who has the true Worship and Service of God, &c. from which, whoever departs, hath no hope of Life.

Optatus Milevitanus lib. 1. contra Parmen. speaks thus to the Donatists, Whilest wicked Children forsaking their Catholic Mother, run away and separate themselves (as you have done, who through Envy are cut off from your Mother the Church) falling into Errors, they turn Rambling Rebels.

400.

The same Optatus in lib. 2. again speaks thus to them; Understand, though late, that you are ungody Children, that you are Boughs broke from the Tree, Branches cut off from the Vine, a Stream divided from its Fountain; and no Stream can be a Fountain by reason of its scarcity of Water, and springs not from it self; neither can a Tree be broken off from its Branch, because a Tree has Roots of its own on which it stands fix'd; but a Branch if it be divided, immediately withers.

S. Hieronymus in lib. 1. contra Jovinianum; Amongst the Twelve, says he, one is chosen, that a Head being appointed, the occasion of Schism might be taken away.

ST. Job. Chrysostom Hom. 11. in c. 4. Ep. ad Ephes. saith, That a certain holy Man affirm'd, that the sin of Schism cannot be wash'd away, even by the Blood of Martyrs.

S. Augustin. lib. de Unit. Eccl. c. 4. Whole Christ is both Head and Body; the Head is the only begotten Son of God, and the Body his Church; Bridegroom and Bride, two in one Flesh. And in c. 19. None can arrive to Salvation, and Life everlasting, but he that has Christ for his Head; and 'tis impossible that any should have Christ for his Head, unless he be a Member of his Body, the Church.

500.

And in Ep. 204. ad Donat. Presbyt. Donatist. Being out of the Pale of the Church, separated from its Unity, and Bond of Charity, thou wouldst not escape Damnation, though thou shouldst be burnt alive in confession of the Name of Christ. Et lib. 2. de Bapt. c. 5. against the Donatists, saith, To break off Communion, to make a Schism, or broach an Heresie, is the Presumption of Devils. And in c. 6. urging them, says, Tell me, Why did you make a Separation? Why did you set up an Altar, in opposition to the whole World? Why do not you hold Communion with those Churches, to which the Apostolical Epistles were directed, which you keep and read, and agreeable to whose Doctrine you say you live? Answer me, Why have you made a Separation?

The Real Prefence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the blessed Eucharist, prov'd by Scripture, and the Testimony of the Holy Fathers. From our Saviour to the Tear

AND first from holy Scripture, Mal. 1. 11. From the rising of the Sun, even to the setting, great is my Name among the Gentiles: And there is sacrificed, and offer'd to my Name in every place a clean Oblation. [This Prophecy is verified in the unbloody Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Saviour in the Mass.]

Matth. 26. 26, 27, 28. Take, eat, this is my Body; this is my Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many unto the Remission of sins.

St. Luke the 22. 19, 20. This is my Body which is given for you. This is the Chalice, the New Testament in my Blood which shall be shed for you.

S. John Evang. c. 6. v. 51. I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven. If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever: And the Bread which I will give, is my Flesh, which I will give for the life of the World. And v. 53. Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you. Who so eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life. 1 Cor. 11. 29. He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning our Lord's Body.

St. Justinus Mart. in Apologia Antonio Pio Imperatori pro Christianis oblata. Now this Food, saith he, amongst us is called the Eucharist, which it is lawful for none to partake of, but those who believe our Doctrine to be true, &c. For we do not receive this as common Bread, or common Drink, but as the Word of God, Jesus Christ our Redeemer being made Man, had both Flesh and Blood for the sake of our Salvation: Just so are we taught, that that Food over which Thanks are given by Prayers in his own Words, and whereby our Blood and Flesh are by a change nourish'd, is the Flesh and Blood of the Incarnate Jesus: For the Apostles in the Commentaries written by them, called the Gospels, have recorded, That Jesus so commanded them.

St. Irenæus lib. 4. c. 57. saith, How can they be assured, the Bread in which Thanks are given (a pacifick Sacrifice) is made the Body of our Lord, and the Chalice his Blood, if they acknowledge him not to be the Son of the Maker of the World?

St. Cyprian in Tractatu de Lapsis, where speaking of those that were fallen, saith, Returning from the Altar of the Devil with their foul and yet stinking Hands, they approach to the holy Table of our Lord, belching forth the Meat sacrific'd to Idols, &c. They invade the Body of our Lord, &c. Whosoever eats the Bread, or drinks the Cup of our Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of our Lord. And yet notwithstanding all this, they offer violence to his Body and Blood, and now more grievously offend their Lord with their Hands and Mouth, than when they deny'd him.

And again in Serm. de Cæna Dom. he saith, The Bread which our Lord gave to his Disciples, being chang'd, not in Shape, but in Nature, by the Omnipotency of the Word, is made Flesh.

Origen. Hom. 7. in Levit. Then the Manna was Meat in Ænigma, but now the Flesh of God is Meat in Specie; as himself says, my Flesh is Meat indeed.

Tertull. lib. 4. contra Marcion. c. 40. The Bread taken and distributed to his Disciples, he made his Body.

From our
Saviour to
the year

ST. Ambrose lib. de his qui *Mysteriis* initiantur c. 9. Consider, says he, whether is more excellent, the Bread of Angels [*Manna*] or the *Flesh of Christ*, which is the *Body of Life*, &c. And a little after; Perchance you'll say, Why do you tell me that I receive the *Body of Christ*, when as I see quite another thing? We have this therefore yet to prove, says he, and (proving it there by too long a Discourse to insert here) he concludes thus; And this *Body* which we make in the *Sacrament*, is that which was born of the *Virgin*. Why do you require here the order of *Nature* in the *Body of Christ*, when as above all *Nature*, *Christ* was born of a *Virgin*? The true *Flesh of Christ* which was crucified, which was buried.

And in lib. 4. de *Sacramentis* c. 5. he saith, Before it be consecrated it is but Bread, but when the words of Consecration come, it is the *Body of Christ*.

400. St. Jerom in Apolog. ad Pammach. asketh, Which is the greater, to pray, or to receive the *Body of Christ*? I know it is the custom at *Rome* for the *Faithful* to receive the *Body of Christ* every day, &c. Optatus Milevit. l. 6. contra Parmen. What is the Altar, but the Seat of the *Body and Blood of Christ*, &c.? You have broke the *Chalice*, the Bearers of *Christ's Blood*?

ST. Augustin. in lib. de Verb. Apost. Sermon. 2. We have heard (says he) our Master, who always speaks Truth, our *Divine Redeemer*, the *Saviour of Men*, recommending to us our Ransome, his *Blood*; for he spoke of his *Body and Blood*, which *Body* he call'd *Meat*, and which *Blood* he call'd *Drink*. The *Faithful* understand the *Sacrament of the Faithful*. But there are some, says he, who do not believe; they said, This is a hard Saying, who can hear him? 'Tis a hard Saying but to those who are obstinate; that is, 'tis incredible but to the incredulous.

300. Et ex Commentario in Psal. 33. he speaks thus of *Christ*; And he was carried in his own Hands, &c. How this can be literally understood of *David*, we cannot discover, but in *Christ* we find it verified; for *Christ* was carried in his own Hands, when giving his own very *Body*, he sayd, *This is my Body*; for that *Body* he carried in his own Hands.

S. Cyril. Alexandrinus lib. 10. in Johan. pag. 862. speaking of the *holy Eucharist*, saith, For why do we eat it? Is it not, that so *Christ* may abide within us, even corporeally, by the Participation and Communion of his *holy Flesh*? 'Tis beyond question, for St. Paul affirms, that the *Gentiles* were made one *Body*, Co-partners, and Co-heirs with *Christ*, &c. By the Participation of the *Body of Christ* and his precious *Blood*, he is united to us, and we again to him.

S. Job. Chrysostom. lib. 3. Sacerdot. He that sits above with his Father, in the same instant of time is touched by all, and gives himself to all who are willing to receive him: Whereas *Christ* leaving his *Flesh* to us, yet is in Heaven also.

Sacramental Confession and Priestly Absolution, prov'd by Scripture, and the Testimony of Holy Fathers.

AND first from Holy Scripture, S. Matth. 18. 18. Amen, I say to you, whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, it shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven. And S. John 20. 23. Receive ye the *Holy Ghost*, whose Sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven unto them; and whose Sins ye retain, they are retained. 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19, 20. St. Paul says, God hath given us the Ministry of Reconciliation, and hath put in us the Word of Reconciliation; for *Christ* therefore are we Legates. And St. James 5. 16. Confess your Sins one to another, &c. And Acts 19. 18. And as many as were converted, came confessing and declaring their Deeds.

300.

St. Ch.

St. Clement Ep. 1. *multo ante med.* saith, But if perhaps *Envy* or *Infidelity*, or any *From our other Evil*, hath crept hiddenly into any ones *Heart*, let him that hath a care of his *Saviour* to *Soul* not blush to *confess* these things to him that *rules* him, that he may be *cured* of the *Tear* him by the *Word of God*, and good *Counsel*. And again St. Peter taught us to break the *evil Thoughts* coming to our *Hearts* upon Christ, and to manifest them to the *Priests* of our *Lord*.

Tertullian lib. de Penitent. c. 7. God foreseeing (saith he) the Poison [Sin] the Gate of Pardon being shut, and the Bolt of Washing being fast, hath yet permitted something to lie open, and hath placed in the *Porch* the second *Penance*, which may open to them that *knock*: And again, Hom. 6. in *Exod.* Let him blot out what hath been committed, by doing *Penance*. vid. c. 8.

And again, in lib. de Penit. He reprehends those who for human basfulness neglected to confess their Sins. vid. c. 8. 300.

St. Irenaeus lib. 1. c. 9. speaking of some Women who had been deceived by Mark the Heretick, and after converted, saith, *Ipsa se penumero cum ad Ecclesiam Dei redissent, confessa sunt.* When as they return to the Church of God, they are *confess'd*. And a little after; When, not without great labour, the Brethren had converted her, she spent all her time in *Confession*.

ORigen Hom. 2. in *Levit. post. med.* There is, saith he, by *Penance*, the Remission of Sins, when he walleth his Bed with *Tears*, and blusheth not to shew his Sin to the Priest of our Lord. And Hom. 17. in S. Lucan, saith, For if we do this [speaking of *Confession*] and reveal our Sins, not only to God, but also to those who are able to cure our Wounds and Sins, our Sins shall be blotted out by him who saith, Behold, I will blot out as a thick Cloud, thy Iniquities, &c. Isa. 44.

And again, Hom. 1. in *Psal. 37.* Peter and Paul, says he, and all such as have been placed in the Church after the Apostles, are Physicians to whom the Discipline of curing Wounds hath been committed, &c. Because God wills not the Death of Sinners, but their Repentance. Vid. Hom. 2. in *Psal. 37.* Et Hom. 17. in *Lucan.* 300.

St. Cyprian in *Tract. de Lapsis*; Let every one of you, I beseech you Brethren, confess his Sin, whilst he is yet in this life, whilst his Confession may be admitted, whilst every ones Satisfaction and Remission made by the Priest, is grateful with our Lord.

ST. Ambrose; Why do ye baptize, if Sins cannot be remitted by a Man? for in Baptism is the Remission of all Sins; nor is it material whether Priests challenge this Power, by *Penance*, or by *Baptism*, for it is the same in both, in lib. 1. de Penit. c. 7. vid. c. 2.

S. Hieron. in lib. 3. c. 16. *Matth.* As there (in the Old Law) the Priest makes the leprous Person clean, or unclean, so here the Bishop or Priest bindeth or looseth. 400.

St. Ambrose (again) in *Orat. Mulierem peccatricem*, saith, Confess freely to a Priest the hidden secrets of thy Soul, and shew them, as thou wouldst thy hidden Wounds to thy Physician.

St. Athanasius *Serm. in illa verba, Invenietis pullum*; If, says he, thy Bonds are not yet loos'd, commend thy self to the Disciples of Jesus; for there be those that can absolve thee by the Power they received from our Saviour, when he said, *Whosoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loos'd in Heaven.*

From our
Saviour to
the Tear

ST. Jo. Chrysost. lib. 3. de Sacerdotibus, faith of Priests, They not only regenerate us (by Baptism) but afterwards have power to pardon us our sins.

S. Augustine Ep. 180. Some runs, says he, unto the Church, asking Baptism, others Reconciliation, others also the doing of Penance it self. All the conferring and making of Sacraments. Vid. lib. 2. de Visitat. infirmorum c. 4.

And again, Hom. 12. Our God, because he is pious and merciful, will have us confess our sins in this World, that we may not be confounded for them in the next.

Et in Hom. 43. Do Penance, says he, such as is done in the Church, that the Church may pray for you. Let none say to himself, I do it privately, &c. Was it then spoken without cause, What you shall loose in Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven? Is it therefore without cause, That the Keys are given to the Church of God? Vid. S. Maxim. Taurinen. in Hom. 5. de Natali SS. Petri & Pauli.

500.

S. Innocent. Papa in Ep. ad Decentium Eugubinum c. 7. Moreover concerning the esteemed weight of sins, it belongs to the Priest to judge, seeing he gives ear to the Confession of the Penitent; and seeing he attends to the Weeping and Tears of him who does Penance, it belongs to him to remit the sin when he shall see sufficient Satisfaction.

Invocation and Prayer to Saints, and that they pray for us; prov'd by Scripture, and the Testimony of Holy Father.

AND first from Holy Scripture; Gen. 48. 16. The Angel that delivered me from all evil, keep these Children. And Hosea the 12. 4. he saith, Jacob prevail'd over the Angel; he wept and prayed to him. Rev. 1. 4. Grace to you, and Peace from him that is, that was, and that shall come, and from the seven Spirits that are in the sight of the Throne. And see Zach. 1. 12. The Angel prays for Juda and Jerusalem. Rev. 5. 8. The four and twenty Elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them Harps, and Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of Saints, See 2 Maccab. chap. last. v. 12, 13, 14. Also read S. Matth. 18. 10. and S. Luke the 15. 10. and Tob. 12. 13.

100.

S. Dionys. Eccles. Hierarch. c. 7. part 3. 83. I constantly affirm, says he, with the Divine Scripture, that the Prayers of the Saints are very profitable for us in this life after this manner: When a man is inflam'd with a desire to imitate the Saints, and distrust his own weakness, betakes himself to any Saint, beseeching him to be his Helper and Petitioner to God for him, he shall obtain by that means very great Assistance.

And in the same Book c. 9. That one Providence of the most high appointing every man to the extended Hands of proper Angels [Guardians] to the safety of all men.

S. Irenaeus lib. 5. c. 19. saith, As Eve was seduced to disobey God, so the blessed Virgin on the contrary, was perswaded to be obedient to God; Uti Virginitas Eva Virgo Maria fieret Advocata. So that the Virgin Mary might become Advocate for the Virgin Eve.

Justin Martyr in Apol. 2. ad Antonium; We worship and adore both God the Father, and the Son, who taught us these things, &c. and also the Company of his Followers, and the good Angels, and we worship them both by Words, and Deeds, and in Truth, even as we our selves have been taught and instructed. And the same Justin Mart. speaking of the care of Angels over us, In Resp. ad qu. 30. Gentil. hath these words, Omnes quidem Angeli, & qui praesunt, & qui parent, functionem explent, casus & in qua ad homines pertinent utilem. Qui autem id munus acceperunt, ut Comites hominum sint & Custodes, semper augentur, minuantur nunquam, &c.

200.

St. Cyprian

ST. Cyprian Ep. 57. Let us pray for each other wherever we are, and ease one another's Troubles by mutual Charity. And which soever of us shall by the Divine Appointment be first taken out of this life, let our Love still continue in the presence of God, and let our Prayers never cease even for our Brethren and Sisters at the Mercy-seat.

From our
Saviour to
the Tear

Origen in Lamentatione; I will begin to fall down on my Knees, and pray to all the Saints to succour me, who dare not ask God, for the exceeding greatness of my sin. O Saints of God! with Tears and Weeping I beseech you to fall down before his Mercy for me a Wretch. And again, Hom. 3. in Cantica. All the Saints departed, bearing yet Charity towards the living, it shall not be inconvenient to say, That they have a care of their Salvation, and help them with their Prayers to Gods for them: For it is written in the Maccabees, This is Jeremy who always prays for the People.

300.

Eusebius Alexandrinus in Homil. de Veneratione Sanctorum refert. Jodoc. Coccius lib. 5. de Sanctis: For this cause hath God taught us to celebrate the Memory of his Saints, that they by receiving and hearing of Hymns and Praises, they may beseech God, that he will admit our poor Prayers.

ST. Ambrose Serm. de SS. Petro & Paulo, saith, Whosoever honoureth the Martyrs, honoureth Christ; and he that despises the Saints, despiseth Christ. And in lib. de Viduis, he says, We are to desire the Assistance of the Angels, who are appointed for our Defence. We are to pray to the Martyrs, whose Patronage we may justly claim, on the account of their Bodies which we possess. They can pray for the Remission of our sins now, who cancell'd their own, if they were guilty of any, by the Effusion of their Blood. Let us not be ashamed to call them in as Advocates for our Failings, who when they were alive, were themselves sensible of the Infirmities of the Body.

400.

St. Hierom Ep. 27. in the Epitaph of Paula, calls upon her thus, Farewel, O Paula, by thy Prayers succour his old Age who honours thee. Thy Faith and good Works unite thee with Christ. Whatever thou shalt ask now, being in his presence, thou wilt the easilier obtain. See what he writes in lib. contra Vigilantium.

ST. Augustin. lib. 20. contra Faustum, c. 21. Christians celebrate together the memory of the Martyrs with a religious solemnity, both to excite to an imitation of them, and that they may be Partakers of their Merits, and be assisted by their Prayers.

And in lib. 7. de Bapt. contra Donatum: Thus he invokes the blessed Martyr St. Cyprian; May he therefore help us in his Prayers, while we are toiling in this mortal Flesh, as in a darksome Cloud, that by God's Grace we may use our best endeavours to imitate his holy Life.

And in Psal. 85. All the Martyrs, says he, that are with Christ intercede for us, nor cease they to pray for us, unless we cease to fight after their example.

300.

S. Chrysostom in Hom. de SS. Bernice, Prosdice, & Domnina; Let us pray to them, and heartily beseech them to be our Patronesses; for their Interest is great, not only whilst alive, but dead also; nay much greater since their Death, &c.

Theodoret. lib. de curandis Græcor. affectionibus Serm. 8. where speaking of their assembling to the Temples of the Martyrs, and praying for particular Necessities, saith, Neither do they make their Addresses to them as to Gods, but only beseech them as holy men to intercede to God for them.

Vid. Theod. Serm. 8. de Martyribus.

Purgatory and Prayer for the Dead, prov'd by Scripture, and the
Testimony of Holy Fathers.

From our
Saviour to
the Tear

AND first from *Holy Scripture*. Thou also in the *Blood* of thy *Testament* hast let forth thy *Prisoners* out of the *Lake* wherein there is not *Water*, *Zach. 9. 11.*

And *Mal. c. 3.* He shall sit as purging fire, and purge the Sons of *Levi*.

S. Matth. 12. 32. Some Sins shall neither be forgiven in this *World*, nor in the *World* to come. [Therefore some are forgiven in the *World* to come, viz. Venial sins.]

100.

1 Corinth. c. 3. v. 13, 14, 15. The work of every man shall be manifest, for the day of our Lord will declare it, because it will be revealed in *Fire*; and the work of every one, of what sort it is the *Fire* shall try; if any mans work abide, he shall receive a reward; if any ones work burn, he shall suffer loss, but himself shall be saved, yet so as by *Fire*.

St. Matth. 5. 27. Be at agreement with thy Adversary, &c. And thou be cast into Prison, Amen. I say to thee, thou shalt not go out from thence till thou hast paid the utmost Farthing. *Vid. 1 Peter 3. 19, 20.*

S. Dionysius lib. de Eccl. Hierar. c. 7. The venerable Prelate coming, prays over the dead Body; he implores the *Divine Clemency* to pardon all the sins committed by the deceased Party.

200.

Tertullian lib. de Corona Militis c. 3. We make, says he, *Oblations* for the Dead, and keep the *Anniversary* of their Birth. And in *lib. 10. de Monagania c. 10.* speaking of the *Obligation* of a *Christian Widow* towards her deceased Husband, he writeth thus; She prays likewise for his Soul, and begs in the mean time *Restefment* for him, and that he may have part in the first *Resurrection*, and makes *Oblations* on the *Anniversary-days* of his Departure.

And in *lib. de Anima c. 18.* *Tertullian* writes thus; Seeing we understand that *Prison* which the *Gospel* demonstrates, to be places below, and the last *Farthing*, we interpret every small *Fault* there to be punish'd by the delay of the *Resurrection*: No man will doubt but that the Soul doth recompence something in the places below.

Read *Ferardentius in Annotation. 3. in Irane. lib. 1. c. 2.*

300.

St. Cyrian in Ep. 52. ad Antonian. where he shews how much the state of *Purgatory* differs from that of *Paradise*, saying, It is one thing to wait for *Pardon*, another thing to come to *Glory*: it is one thing to be sent into *Prison*, from whence not to return till he has paid the utmost *Farthing*; another thing presently to receive the *Reward* of *Faith* and *Virtue*: It is one thing for sins to be mended, to be tormented by long Pains, and to be purged a long time by *Fire*; and another thing to have all sins cleansed by *Suffering*: And lastly, it is one thing to rely upon the *Sentence* of our Lord in the day of *Judgment*, and another thing to be now presently crowned by our Lord.

Eusebius Alexandrinus in Hom. de Dominica refert. cocc. lib. de Penitent. Art. 5. In the *Oblation*, says he, be mindful of thy Parents and Brethren, who are now departed this Life, for by so doing thou procurest great rest to the Souls departed.

Arnob. l. 4. adv. Gen. p. ult. What reason was there that our Churches should be thrown down, in which Prayers were offered to our Sovereign God, Peace and Mercy was implor'd for all, for *Magistrates, Armies, Kings, Friends and Enemies*, whether alive or dead.

ST. *Cyillus Hierosol. Catech. Mystag. 5.* Then, says he, we pray for the *holy Fathers* From our
and *Bishops* deceased, and last of all for such as have died amongst us; firmly *Saviour to*
believing that those *Souls* find great Relief, for whom the *Prayer* is offer'd of that ho- the Tear
ly and awful Sacrifice which lies upon the *Altar*.

St. John Chrysostom Homil. 3. in Ep. ad Philip. These things were not in vain ordain'd
by the *Apostles*, that in the venerable and dreadful Mysteries (the *Mass*) there should
be made a Memory of those who are departed this life; they knew much benefit
would accrue to them. 400.

St. Gregory Nissen. in Orat. de mortuis, saith, That such as die, having been cleans'd
from their *sins*, either in this life by *Prayers* and the practice of *Vertue*; or after their
death, having made satisfaction in the *Furnace* of the purging *Fire*, are receiv'd into
bliss. *Vid. S. Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 39. in sancta Lumina. Et Basil. in c. 9. Isa. See S. Epiph.*
Heret. 75. 12. 8.

ST. *John Chrysostom Hom. 41. in Ep. 1. ad Corinth.* If a *Sinner* has departed this
Life, &c. we must relieve him as much as possible, not by our *Tears*, but by pray-
ing for him, by giving *Alms*, and making *Oblations* for his *Soul*, &c. Neither is it in
vain that he that officiates at the *Altar* in the time of *Divine Sacrifice*, cries out thus:
For all those that sleep in *Christ*, and for them that make Commemoration for
them; for if there were no Commemoration made for the *Dead*, there would be no
such thing said. For what we do here is no *Stage-play*, no, God forbid, but what is
instituted by the *Holy Ghost*. Let us therefore help them, and make Commemora-
tion for them. 500.

S. Augustinus in lib. 2. de Genesi contra Manicheos c. 20. He who has not perhaps
till'd his Field, but has suffer'd Thorns to over-grow it, hath in this life the Curse of
his Land in all his Works, and after this life shall either shave the Fire of Purgation,
or else eternal Pain. *Et in lib. de Civit. Dei c. 24.* Neither could it be truly said of
some, That they are neither forgiven in this Life, nor in the Life to come, unless
there were some, who, though they are not forgiven in this Life, yet should be in
the Life to come. *Et in Enchir. c. 110.* Neither is it to be denied, that the Souls of
the *Dead* are eased by the Piety of their living Friends, when the Sacrifice of the
Mediator is offer'd for them, &c.

Vide S. Aug. lib. de cura pro mortuis. c. 1. Et lib. 9. Confess. 12, 13.

The Eighteen General Councils, which (with the Catalogue of Chief Pastors) sufficiently shews the Churches Visibility, and continued Succession in all Ages, until this our present Age.

The first Council of Nice, Pope Sylvester presiding, *Fathers* 318. Anno Domini 325. against Arius the Heretick. Authors Euseb. Socrat. Baronius.

I. Of Constantinople, Pope Damasus presiding, *Fathers* 150. Anno Dom. 381. against Macedonius the Heretick. Authors, Genebr. Photius, Socrat. Baronius.

I. Of Ephesus, Pope Celestine presiding, *Fathers* 200. Anno Dom. 431. against Nestorius the Heretick. Authors, Nicephor. Sigibert. Genebr. Baron.

Chalcedon, Pope Leo presiding, *Fathers* 600. Anno 451. against Dioscorus and Eutyches, Hereticks. Authors, Sigibertus, Baronius. Leo Ep. 50.

II. Of Constantinople, Pope Vigilius presiding, *Fathers* 165. Anno 553. against Peter Archbishop of Constanti-

nople. Anthim. Theodor. &c. Authors, Niceph. Baron.

III. Of Constantinople, Pope Agatho presiding, *Fathers* 289. Anno 680. against the Monotholites, Paul, Sergius, Cyrus, Theod. &c. Authors, Cedrenus, Baron.

II. Of Nice, Pope Adrian I. presiding, *Fathers* 350. Anno 787. against the Iconoclasts. It condemned the Synod of Constant. under Leo the Her. Emp. Auth. Cedr. Bar.

IV. Of Constantinople, Pope Adrian the II. presiding, *Fathers* 101. Anno 869. against Photius for usurping the Chair of Constantinople, &c. Authors, Niceph. Bar.

I. Of Lateran, Pope Calixtus II. presiding, *Fathers* 300. Anno 1122. to reconcile Christian Princes, and to drive out the Saracens from the H. Land. Authors, Plat. Bar.

II. Of Lateran, Pope Innocent II. presiding, *Fathers* 1000. Anno 1139. for the conservation of Ecclesiastical Rights, and against Peter the Anti-Pope. On. Bar.

III. Of Lateran, Pope Alexander III. presiding, *Fathers* 300. Anno 1179. against the Albigenis and Waldo, the Her. Merchant of Lions. Authors, Platin. Onn. Bar.

IV. Of Lateran, Pope Innocent III. presiding, *Fathers* 1285. Anno 1215. in part against the Albigenis and Sacramentarians, &c. & in part for the H. Land. Gen. Spond.

I. Of Lions, Pope Innocent IV. presiding, *Fathers* 140. Anno 1245. against the Emper. Frederic II. where S. Lewis K. of France is made Head of the Exp. to the H. Lan.

II. Of Lions, Pope Gregorius X. presiding, *Fathers* 1000. Anno 1274. against

the Errors of the Greeks, and for the H. Land. Authors, Plat. Onup. Spondan.

Vienna, Pope Clement V. presiding, *Fathers* 300. Anno 1311. against the Beguards and other Heresies, and for recovery of the H. Land. Auth. Plat. Onn. Spond.

Florence, Pope Eugenius IV. presiding, *Fathers* 141. Anno 1439. in this was the Greek Schismatics again united to the Ch. of Rome, & subscrib'd it, Auth. Pla. Spon.

V. Lateran, Pope Julius II. & Leo X. presiding, *Fathers* 114. Anno 1512. partly against the Turks, partly for reformation of manners. Authors, Genebrard. Onuph.

Trent, Pope Paul the III. & Pius IV. presiding, *Fathers* 255. Anno 1545. against Martin Luther, Calvin, and other Hereticks, and for Reformation of Manners, Onn. Gen.

The

The Definitions of some Councils.

THE first Council of Nice, *Can. 39. Abrab. Defined*, That he who holds the See of Rome, is the Head and Chief of all the Patriarchs, seeing he is the first, as Peter to whom power is given over all Christian Princes, and all their People, as he who is Vicar of Christ our Lord over all People, and the Universal Church of Christ; and he who shall contradict this, is Excommunicated by the Council. This Council also defined, *lib. 3. Decret. de Divina Mensa*. That the Lamb of God which takes away the sins of the World, is placed upon the Sacred Table to be sacrificed by the Priest unbloodily: And that we receiving his precious Body and Blood, do believe these things to be Signs of our Resurrection. And in *Can. 18*. It calls the blessed Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ. And in *Can. 14*. it saith, That Deacons (who have no power to offer Sacrifice) ought not to give the Body and Blood of Christ to Priests who have such power. The same Council in *C. 65. Arabian. Cod. decreed*, That a Bishop dying, notice of his Death shall be given to all Churches and Monasteries in the Parish, that Prayer may be made for him. And *Can. 11*. it decreed, That such as deny'd their Faith, should do many years Penance.

The second Council of Nice, *Act. 3. 6. saith*, Let us do all things with the Fear of God, asking the Intercessions of the unspotted Mother of God; as also of the Angels, and all the Saints. The same Council, concerning Ecclesiastical Traditions, defines thus: Whosoever shall dare to think otherwise, or teach after the Custom of wicked Hereticks, to violate Ecclesiastical Traditions, let him be Anathema, *Act. 7. p. 685*.

The fourth Lateran Council defin'd *C. 1*. That Bread is by the Divine Power Transubstantiated into the Body, and Wine into the Blood of Christ.

Berengarius, Head of the Sacramentarians, was condemn'd first in a Council held at Rome, *An. 1050*. and by another at Marcellus under Pope Leo the IX. *An. 1053*. and also by another held at Lateran under Pope Nich. II. *Anno 1057*. where he abjur'd his Heresie, and dy'd a Catholic. And lastly, his Heresie was condemn'd in the 4th. great Council of Lateran, by 1285 Fathers. In which Council also Transubstantiation was defined, as is said above.

The Council of Constance (ended under Pope Martin the V.) *Anno 1418*. condemned Jo. Wickliffe, Jo. Hus, and Jer. of Prague for Hereticks.

The Council of Florence *Decret. Sup. union. Jacobino. & Armenor. defin'd*, That by Virtue of the words of Consecration, the Substance of the Bread is converted into the Body of Christ, and the Substance of the Wine into his Blood. In the same Decree it defines Penance to be a Sacrament, and that the Effect of it, is Absolution from sin.

Apostolical Traditions.

WHAT you see here own'd by a general Consent of Holy Fathers to be the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, the very same is deliver'd down to us by an uninterrupted Tradition, as the Faith and Doctrine of the same Church. And that Apostolical Tradition is the true Rule of Christian Faith, shall be yet here prov'd by the Testimony of Holy Scriptures, and of those Primitive Fathers. And first, in 2 *Thess. 2. 15*. Therefore Brethren stand ye fast, and hold the Traditions which ye have learn'd, whether by Word, or by our Epistle. *Phil. 4*. Those things which you have been taught, and heard, and seen in me, those do ye. 2. *Tim. 22*. The thing that thou hast

hast heard of me before many *Witnesses*, the same commend thou to *faithful men*, which shall be fit to teach others also. *Fathers* in the second Century, *St. Iraneus advers. Hæc. lib. 3. c. 3.* If the *Fathers* had left us no *Scripture* at all, ought we not to follow the order of *Traditions*?

In the third Century, *Tertullian vide lib. de Præscript. c. 17, 19, 21, 37.* What I believe, says he, I receiv'd from the present Church, the present Church from the Primitive, that from the *Apostles*, the *Apostles* from *Christ*. In the same Century, *Origen Tract. 29. in c. 24. Matth. sub fin. saith*, In our understanding *Scripture*, we must not depart from the first *Ecclesiastical Tradition*.

In the fourth Century, *S. Athanasius lib. 1. de Decret. Concil. Niceni.* This Doctrine, says he, we have demonstrated to have been delivered from Hand to Hand, by *Fathers* to *Sons*. *S. Hieronym. in Dialogo contra Luciferianos c. 4.* Although, says he, it were not under the Authority of *Holy Scripture*, yet the Consent of the whole World in this part gives it the Authority of a Precept. For there are also many things, which by *Tradition* are observed in the Churches, that challenge to themselves the Authority of *Written Laws*. *Epiphanius Hæres. 61. saith*, We must use *Traditions*, for the *Scriptures* have not all things, &c.

In the fifth Century, *S. Jo. Chrysostom. Hom. 4. in 2 Thess. 2.* It is evident, says he, that the *Apostles* did not deliver all things by *Writing*, but many things without, and these be as worthy Credit as the other. *S. Augustine Ep. 118. ad Januar. saith*, But those things which we, and the whole World observe, without any Authority of *Writing*, but only of *Tradition*, 'tis to be understood, were commanded and appointed to be retain'd either by the *Apostles*, or *General Councils*, which are of *Authority* in the Church. And *lib. 2. contra Julianum c. 10.* What they have found in the Church, that have they kept; what they have learned, that have they taught; what they have receiv'd from their *Fathers*, that have they deliver'd to their *Sons*. *Vid. S. Aug. lib. 4. de Bapt. contra Donat. c. 23, 24.*

Ad Gloriam Dei, Amen.

Per T. W.

THE
PAMPHLET
ENTITLED,
Speculum Ecclesiasticum,
OR AN
ECCLESIASTICAL PROSPECTIVE - GLASS,
CONSIDERED,
In its Falſe
REASONINGS
AND
QUOTATIONS.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Ric. Chitwell*, at the *Rose and Crown* in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDC LXXXVIII.

IMPRIMATUR,

Hic Liber cui Titulus, [*The Speculum Ecclesiasticum, &c.*
Considered, &c.]

Oct. 24. 1687.

Hen. Maurice R^{mo}. in Christo
P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep.
Cant. a Sacris.

THE
PAMPHLET
ENTITLED,
SPECULUM ECCLESIASTICUM:
OR, AN
Ecclesiastical Prospective-Glass, &c.

THere can be no greater Argument of a baffled and erroneous Cause, than when the Assertors of it are forced to maintain it with manifest Impostures. The Religion of the Church of *Rome* is in great measure owing to Legends and Forged Writings: With the first they deluded the vulgar; and with the second, circumvented the wiser part of mankind. The Usurpation of the See of *Rome* was never submitted to, nor its Primacy believed in the *West*, till the spurious Decretals of *Isidore Mercator* were universally received by a blind and ignorant Age, and believed to be the genuine Decrees of Ancient Popes. No sooner did Learning begin to flourish in the last Age, but these Phantasms disappeared, were decried, and disowned by all learned and ingenuous men. To produce them anew upon the stage, and urge the Authority of them in this learned

age, can be no other than the last efforts of a despairing and dying Cause, which wanteth both Reason and Truth to uphold it. To recur to these Forgeries, after the falseness and folly of them hath been detected and demonstrated by learned men of both Communions; is an invincible Argument, that the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* was at first founded on them, and cannot now be maintain'd without them.

It may justly be wondred, that men whose office and design it is to uphold the Cause of the Church of *Rome*, and perswade others of the truth of it, should make use of such artifices, as will infallibly, when discovered, make all sober men suspect her Cause of falseness, and accuse her Agents of dishonesty. Yet this hath been lately done by some Gentlemen of the Church of *Rome*, in a little Pamphlet, called *Speculum Ecclesiasticum*, or an *Ecclesiastical Prospective-Glass*; wherein all the Ancient Forgeries of the Church of *Rome* are reproduced, and alledged as undoubted Testimonies of Antiquity. An Imposture so gross and palpable, that if unadvisedly committed, the Ignorance of this Author must be deplorable; if voluntarily, his Fraud must be detestable. Such miserable delusions are unfitly calculated for our Age, and can serve for no other end, than for what they were at first invented, to amuse Children, and seduce weak people.

The Author divideth his *Prospective-Glass* into eight Parts or Columes; and in them undertaketh to prove the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome* from Scripture, and the Testimonies of the Fathers of the Church for the first 500 years. The proofs of Scripture I shall not consider, because they are either wholly impertinent, or have been often answered by the Writers of our Church; and upon the Testimonies of Antiquity, I will only make some

some few Observations: For so idle a Paper deserves not a strict and severe Answer.

The first **Column** of our Adversary treateth of the Churches continued Succession, and the tradition of all Christian Doctrines through all Ages of the Church. This might well have been spared, and concerns no more the Church of *Rome*, than it doth any other particular Church. In the Church of *England* we have a Succession of Bishops continued down from the Apostolick times to this day. The nomination or particular enumeration of them, is neither necessary nor useful. None will deny the Churches of *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, and *Philadelphia* to have enjoyed a continued Series of Bishops from the Apostles times; yet are the names of the far greater part of them unknown. Neither is the Succession of the Bishops of *Rome* certain and undoubted. The immediate Successors of St. *Peter* are at this day unknown. *Linus* most probably died before him. *Cletus* and *Anacletus* were most certainly the same person. In succeeding Ages many great and long Schisms happened, wherein two, and sometimes three Popes together pretended to the Papal Chair, whose right was so dubious and uncertain, that *Wernerus Rolluinck* * professeth, most learned and conscientious men could not discern to which party they ought to adhere. And at this day, the *French* and *Italian* Writers agree not in composing a Catalogue of Popes; the first placing divers among the Popes, which the second reject as Antipopes. No other eminent See of the Catholick Church hath suffered these divisions: So that the Succession of the Bishops of *Rome* is more doubtful and uncertain than any other Succession of Bishops in the World. St. *Irenæus* indeed, St. *Augustin*, and *Optatus*, alledged by this Writer, disputing against the Hereticks, object to them that they are upstarts,

* Fascic.
Temp.

starts, men of yesterday, who could not deduce their Succession from the Apostles; whereas their Catholicks had a visible Succession of Bishops presiding in their Churches from the Apostles times: and to prove this, produce the Succession of *Roman* Bishops, not as of so many Heads of the Universal Church, but as of the Bishops of the most eminent See of the Western Church. For the force of their Argument lay not in the particular Succession of the *Roman* Bishops, but in the several Successions of all the Catholick Bishops of the Universal Church; of which they produced that of *Rome* as an example. This appears plainly from the words of *Irenæus*, who prefixeth this Preface to his Catalogue of *Roman* Bishops: *Seeing it is too much to reckon up the Succession of all Churches, I will instanciate only in that of Rome*: As for Succession of Doctrine, we may with far greater justice claim that, than do our Adversaries. For the Church of *England* admitteth, receiveth, and believeth all Doctrines which have been universally taught and delivered down by all Churches in all Ages; and proposeth none to her Children as necessary to be believed, which have not that universal testimony: Whereas the Church of *Rome* commandeth several Doctrines to be believed upon pain of *Anathema*, which were unknown to Antiquity, and are at this day denied by the greater part of Christians.

The Fourth Column of the Unity of the Church, is of the same stamp. We, no less firmly, than our Adversaries, believe the *Catholick Church to be one*: We willingly allow that there is no hope of Salvation out of the Pale of that Church, and have always asserted Schism to be a damnable sin. But that the particular Church of *Rome*, or in Communion with the See of *Rome*, is that Universal Church; that a small and corrupt member

ber of it is the whole; and that all Churches not Communicating with the Bishop of *Rome*, are Schismatical; this we neither believe, nor can our Adversaries prove: Certainly all the testimonies here alledged insinuate no such thing. But if Schism be so great a sin, if wilful and unnecessary Separation from any part of the Catholick Church be damnable; What shall we say of those persons, whose office and employment it is to promote and foment this Schism, and draw the Members of the Church of *England* into an unlawful separation from her? To accuse the Church of *England* of Schism or Separation from the *Papists*, is to go contrary to sense and reason: For 'tis notorious to the whole World, that all the Subjects of *England* communicated with our Church till the 10th year of *Queen Elizabeth*; when upon the Pope's prohibition, a small party flew off into separate Assemblies, who have since continued their separate Meetings under the name of *Roman Catholicks*. And shall the Church of *England* be said to have separated from those men? This cannot be said with any colour of Truth. That Papal prohibition began the Schism, which till then had no existence. For the Church of *England* never did by any judicial act forbid her Children to Communicate with the Catholick Churches beyond Sea; nor require of her Communicants the belief of any point denied by them, or disbelief of any point maintained by them.

The third **Column**, of the Churches Infallibility, is of the same nature, and equal impertinence. We believe there ever was since the time of Christ, and shall be to the end of the World, a Church, or collection of men, believing all things necessary to Salvation. But that this Church is no other than the particular Church of *Rome*; and that to the belief of all necessary Articles, some false.

false.

false and erroneous Opinions never was, nor shall be intermixed; we do not believe, and it never can be proved. Now all the Testimonies alledged by our Author amounts to no more than this, That the Church of Christ is indefectible, ever did and always shall exist. That the whole Faith of Christ is always taught and preserved in it; and that in her Bosom Salvation may ever be found and obtained: But all this doth no more concern The Church of *Rome*, than it doth the Church of *England*. Our Author indeed alledgeth Three passages, wherein the Church of *Rome* is particularly mentioned: The first is a Complement of St. *Cyprian's* to Pope *Cornelius*, That to St. *Peter's* Chair Infidelity cannot have access. This hath been oftentimes answered by our Divines, and is indeed a meer Compliment, or at most, a declaration of his expectations groundd upon the prospect of a Learned and Orthodox Clergy, which then presided in the See of *Rome*. Besides infinite places of the Ancients might be produced, wherein they bestow no less Encomiums upon particular Churches, which by the confession of our Adversaries not only may, but have actually fallen from the Faith. Thus St. *Ignatius* saith, the Church of *Ephesus* was predestinated before all Ages, to continue for ever in a permanent and unchangeable glory. An expression which infinitely surpasseth St. *Cyprian's* Compliment. The Second passage is taken from *Victor Vitenfis*, whom our Author ignorantly calls *Uticensis*, where *Eugenius* Bishop of *Carthage* being urged by the *Arian* Tyrant *Hunnericus* to give an account of his Faith, desired leave to send to all his Fellow Bishops in the whole Catholick Church that they might meet in a General Council, particularly to the Bishop of *Rome*, who was the most eminent Bishop of the Western Church and first Patriarch of the World. For no General Council

Perfidia.

Epist. ad Ephes.

cil could be held without the presence of all the Patriarchs either by themselves, or by their Legates. That *Eugenius* desired not the presence or advice of the Pope for any belief of his Infallibility, is manifest from what *Victor* * immediately subjoins, that *Eugenius* said this, not because there were wanting men in *Africa*, who were able to refute the objections of the *Arians*, and vindicate the Catholick Cause: But that such Bishops might be drawn into *Africa*, as feared not the threats and violence of *Hunericus*, being none of his natural Subjects. The third is a passage of *St. Cyril of Hierusalem* in his Apology against *Rufinus*, that the Roman Faith, commended by the Apostles, cannot be changed. Of this Apology I shall speak somewhat hereafter: To the words alledged, I need only say, our Adversaries can never prove that unchangeable Faith, which the Apostle commended, to be the Faith of the present Church of Rome.

* De Persecur.
Vandal. l. 2.

Thus have we proved three of our Authors eight Columns to be wholly trifling and impertinent; I will next observe his ignorance and mistakes of Chronology. *St. Cyprian* is by him placed before *Origen*; when as the latter was a famous Writer of the Church long before the first was converted to the Faith. *Gregory Nyssen* and *St. Hierom* are ranked before *Athanasius*; who was a Bishop before either of the other were born. *Tertullian* before *Theophilus Antiochenus*, who was a Bishop near Twenty five years before the other was made Priest. *Victor Vitenfis* placed in the beginning of the 4th Age, who lived in the end of the 5th. But our honest Author, because he writ of a Persecution, thought he must necessarily mean an Heathen Persecution, and therefore set him before *Lactantius*. In the same manner he placeth *St. Cyril of Alexandria* before *St. Chrysostom*; and *St.*

H

Ambrose

Ambrose before *St. Athanasius*. But Chronology is not the business of our Author. Let us next view his Criticism: where we shall find all the Fables and Forgeries of Ancient and latter times adapted and produced by him.

I begin with the Decretals of the Ancient Popes; out of which he cites the Epistles of *St. Clemens*, *Anacletus*, and *Pius*. It were superfluous to resume an Argument so often cleared, and to prove these Epistles to be spurious, if we had not to deal with a generation of men, whose either ignorance or effrontery requireth it. This hath been often confessed, and at large demonstrated by Learned Writers of the Church of *Rome*, but more fully by the Reformed Divines: Insomuch that it is long since become a received and undoubted opinion among all the learned men of both Communions. And indeed the thing is manifest beyond all contradiction; For no Pope, Father, or Writer, before the 9th Age ever made mention of them. The Vulgar Version of the Bible is constantly used in them, which was not composed till the beginning of the fifth Age. They are almost wholly made up of an infinite number of passages stoln from the Writings, Canons and Constitutions of Authors, Councils, Popes and Emperors, who lived between the Third and the Ninth Age. They are neither adapted to the genius, nor necessities of those times: Frequently they oppose Heresies, which began not till the 4th Age. Are full of ridiculous Anachronisms, barbarous Phrases, and foolish Solecisms, which those first and purer Ages could not be guilty of. Lastly, they mention many points of Discipline and Ecclesiastical Terms, which were unknown to the three first Ages, and not introduced till some Ages after. Not only the falsity of these *Decretals* is apparent and confessed; but their Author and Age

age can be assigned. They were first published to the World by *Riculpus Bishop of Mentz*, who received them from *Isidore Mercator* in the beginning of the *Ninth Age*. *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, *Perrou*, and *Petavius* acknowledged them to be dubious, and dare not defend them. But latter Criticks of the Church of *Rome* openly confess them to be spurious. Thus *Labbe* and *Cossart* in their Collection of Councils, affix a note of falsity to every one of them: And particularly give this Censure of most of them: That they are esteemed *suppositions by learned Catholicks*. *Baluzius* † gives an account of their Original, progress and reception in the *Gallican Church*: And *Du Pin* affirmeth, They are rejected with a common consent.

† A prelat.
ad Reginon.

The spurious Writings of *Dionysius the Areopagite*, come next to be considered: Which forgery our Author so fully believeth, that he ever placeth them immediately after the Holy Scriptures. That they belong not to the *Areopagite* is manifest from the universal silence of the ancients, till the *Sixth Age*: The subtle argumentation and elaborate stile of them far different from the simplicity of the Apostolick times. They were writ in the flourishing estate of the Church; and therefore make no mention of Martyrs or Persecutions; but rather frequently oppose the Heresie of *Arius*. The Author of them cites the *Apocalypse* of *St. John*, and *Ignatius* his Epistles, particularly that to the *Romans*, written just before his Martyrdom in the year 107. long after the *Areopagites* death. I might add; that he mentions many Ceremonies not introduced into the Church till the *Fourth Age*; speaks of the Order of *Munks*, and cites *St. Clement* of *Alexandria*. But I need not insist any longer upon a thing so evident. The falsity of these Writings is confessed, and demonstrated

by *Petavius, Morinus, Launoy, Oudin, Du Pin*, and many other learned Authors of the Church of *Rome*.

The Commentaries of *Theophilus Bishop of Antioch* upon the Gospels, are most certainly the product of a *Latin Writer*, and therefore spurious. Such Commentaries were indeed anciently extant under *Theophilus* his name; but were rejected by *St. Hierom* (a) as supposititious. As for those we now have, they were forged after *St. Cyprian's* time. For the Author transcribes a passage out of *Cyprian's* sixth Epistle to *Magnus*. Upon which account, *Labbe* and *Du Pin* do esteem this Work to be spurious. The Oration of *St. Hippolitus* the *Consummation of the World*, is of the same stamp, as appears from the barbarous stile, childish expressions, and foolish Fables, which may be found in it. For which reasons *Du Pin* saith, It is very uncertain, and may be justly call'd in question.

But to what miserable shifts is our Author reduced, when he citeth the Epistle of *St. Athanasius to Pope Felix*; an Epistle forged by *Isidore Mercator*, together with the *Decretals*, and almost wholly patch't up out of the Acts of the *Lateran Council* under *Pope Martin*, in the year 649: And wherein *Athanasius* tells *Felix*; that he had been ordained Bishop at *Rome* by his sacred hands; whereas the true *Athanasius* was ordained at *Alexandria* more than Forty years before *Felix* was made Pope. *Binius* acknowledgeth it to be spurious, and *Labbe* (b) gives this scornful censure of it '*Ad malas Mercatoris merces has ineptæ farraginis quisquilias*. 'Baronius, '*aliique eruditi viri ablegant*; which I will not translate, lest I should be thought to rail, instead of confuting.

However, to alledge a spurious Writing, may be only a matter of artifice to impose upon an unwary Reader: But to cite the undoubted Work of one Author, under the

(a) De Script.
Eccl. cap. 25.

(b) Concil.
Tom. II. p. 844.

the name of another, to whom it was never before attributed, can be no other than gross ignorance. Our Author citeth St. *Hierom's* Third Apology against *Ruffinus* under the name of St. *Cyril of Hierusalem*, who was dead many years before the name of *Ruffinus* was known, or this Apology written. Whether this was a matter of design, that the Reader might never be able to consult the place, our Author can best tell. Certainly the passage is infinitely trifling and impertinent: For St. *Hierom* accusing *Ruffinus* of a forgery in publishing at *Rome* an Apology for *Origen*, under the name of *Pamphilus* the Martyr, tells him he had mist of his design; For the *Romans* did not believe it to be the Work of that Martyr: And then adds, that the *Roman* Faith, commended by the Apostle, could not be imposed upon by such tricks. This is a piece of flattery, which even no sober *Papist* will allow to be strictly true. For all grant that the whole Church may be deceived in judging a matter of fact; such is, whether this or that Author writ such a Treatise. And the Church of *Rome* hath been actually deluded by many Impostures of this nature, as the Spurious *Decretals of Isidore Mercator*, which she received and used as genuine for many Ages. But not to depart from this very instance, St. *Hierom* hath sufficiently refuted his own words by imposing upon the *Romans*, in perswading them that this Apology, translated and published by *Ruffinus*, was not the work of *Pamphilus*, but of *Eusebius*. For it truly belonged to the former. *Eusebius* indeed added Five Books to it. But those were not translated by *Ruffinus*.

That the Book *de Cena Domini* should in this Age be cited under the name of *Cyprian*, may be justly admired; when it is not only confessed by all to be spurious, but the true Author of it is known, *Arnoldus Abbot*

bot of *Bonvalle* in *France*, in the Twelfth Age. To him do *Raynaudus*, *Labbe*, *Oudin*, *Du Pin*, and almost all Manuscript Copies ascribe it.

St. *Ambrose's* Work of the *Sacraments* hath been call'd in question by many great and learned men of the Reformed Churches. If it should be allowed in the main to belong to St. *Ambrose*; they must, however, grant that it hath been miserably interpolated and corrupted by latter hands. For *Bertram* citeth several places out of it, which cannot now be found in it. But if this be dubious, it is most certain that the Sermons of St. *Ambrose* are spurious: Being no other than a Collection of the Sermons of several Authors, some more, others less ancient. This *Bellarmin* and *Labbe* acknowledg. Many of them may be found among the Sermons of *Maximus Taurinensis*, and particularly that of St. *Peter and Paul*, cited by our Author. The books de *Pœnitentia*, *Petrus Soto* (a) maintains to be spurious; and some learned men have subscribed to his Opinion. In like manner *Erasmus* contends that the Homilies of *Origen* upon the *Psalms* are spurious, and *Bellarmin* placeth them among the dubious Writings. But in these Two last Cases, nothing certain can be determined.

(a) Institut.
Sacerd. tit. de
necess. Confes.
Lect. 2.

The books de *Vistatione Infernorum*, cited by our Author, under the name of St. *Augustin*, *Bellarmin* and *Labbe* confess to be spurious. That they are so, need no other argument than the foolish arguments and barbarous stile of them, unworthy of the judgment and learning of St. *Augustin*. *Erasmus* giveth this Censure of them, *The work of a prating Fellow, who had neither Wit nor Learning. What shame or reason have those persons left, who obtrude such Writings to us under the name of Augustin?* Our Author refers us to the Second book of

of this Treatise for a proof of Sacerdotal confession. There indeed we may find this Confession commended, advised and enjoyned (which is also done by the Church of *England*) but in the mean while the necessity of it disowned, and the sufficiency of a private confession to God acknowledged. For the Author blaming some persons who dehorted men from Sacerdotal confession, saith, Let not the superstition of these Dreamers seduce you, which confirmeth sinners in their resolutions of not confessing to a Priest, *Quia salvat Sacerdote inconsulto ad Deum peccatorum confessio: Because confession of sins to God without consulting any Priest, is sufficient to Salvation:* Where he plainly allows the truth of this proposition, but blames the ill application of it. But because our Author refers us to this spurious Treatise; I would desire him to turn one Page farther, where he will find the Doctrine of doing any Penance after Death, and consequently of Purgatory, called a detestable blindness of heart, and occasion of the destruction of Souls.

O exterminanda cordis
cæcatio. O
perditionis
animarum occasio. l. 2. c. 8.

The *Questiones ad Græcos*, cited by our Author under the name of *St. Justin Martyr*, are on all sides confessed to be supposititious, particularly by *Bellarmin*, *Labbe*, and *Du Pin*. The justice of this Censure is evidently evinced from the frequent mention therein, made of the *Manichees*, who were not heard of till more than a Hundred years after *Justin's* death. The Lamentation of *Origen* is the trifling product of some foolish *Latin* Writer; and therefore justly rejected as spurious by *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, (a) *Labbe*, *Huetius*, (a) *Ad an. 252.* and *Du Pin*. I might add, that it was formerly condemned by Pope *Gelasius*, if his Decretal were not equally spurious. However, that excuseth not our Author; since that Decretal is universally received by all the Writers of the Church of *Rome*.

Our

Our Author citeth, *Two-Fragments of Eusebius Alexandrinus* out of *Jodocus Coccius*. But we have great reason to believe, that they are not genuine. For *Eusebius Cæsariensis* (a) in mentioning *Eusebius Alexandrinus*, speaks not one word of his Writings; which that accurate Historian would by no means have omitted, if there had been any known in his time. No one of the Ancients make the least mention of such a Writer: Nor was he ever heard of till *Coccius* and *Turrain* produced some fragments out of his Homilies. As for *Coccius*, he had not skill enough in this kind to pass a critical judgment upon the Writings of the ancients: and *Turrain* cannot be securely trusted. For all the World knows with how great violence he maintained the Apostolick Canons and Constitutions to be genuine: A position which none but fools and mad men can believe.

The *Arabick Canons* of the first Council of *Nice*, are a no less foolish than evident forgery of latter times. All the *Greek* and *Latin* Copies give us no more than XX. Canons of that Council. *Gelasius Cyzicenus* saith (b) no more were made. The *African* Bishops sending into the East for true and correct Copies of them, receive from *Atticus* of *Constantinople*, and *Cyril* of *Alexandria* no more than XX. and these LXXX. *Arabick* Canons were never heard of till brought out of the East in the last Age by the Legates sent by *Pius IV.* to the Patriarch of *Alexandria* to invite him to the Council of *Trent*. But I need not use many arguments. They sufficiently betray themselves by the frequent mention of Names, Rites, and Customs which obtained not in the Church till after the Council of *Nice*. I will instance only in their several Constitutions, about Monasteries, Monks and Nuns, as that they be shav'd, and use a distinct habit

(a) Hist. Eccl.
l. 7. c. 2.

(b) Hist. Con.
Nic. l. 2. c. 30.

bit from the rest of mankind; customs which were not known till some Ages after. And that we may not seem singular in making this Censure, the Learned *Abraham Ecchellenfis* (c) confesseth, That many of them were forged, others changed, and all accommodated by the several Sects of the *East* to their several Ages and Perswasions. (c) Prefat. ad Version.

The sincerity of our Author deserveth next to be considered, which I fear would be found very small if I had time and leisure to compare all his Citations with the Originals. Those few which I have compared, give me a just suspicion of his fraudulent dealing in the rest, and may reasonably create the same prejudice in all his Readers. I will produce a few Instances. In the Fifth Column he citeth these words of *Irenæus* (a), *How can they be assured the Bread is made the Body of our Lord?* (d) L. 4. c. 57. In the Original it is *esse Corpus suum*, where he hath Translated *esse* to be *made*. A few lines after he produceth a passage of *Tertullian*, which no man in his right wits could ever have alledged for Transubstantiation: For the intire sentence is one of the most pregnant Testimonies of all Antiquity, against that monstrous opinion; the words are these (d), *The Bread taken and distributed to his Disciples, he made his Body, by saying, This is my Body, that is, the Figure of my Body.* Our Author hath cut off the latter part, and given us only the first words of this Passage. What name ought justly to be given to this Artifice, let others judg; but certainly none can call it sincerity. The corruption of *Justin Martyr* in the 7th Column is no less gross and evident; where our Author citeth these words out of his Second Apology: *We worship them* (the good Angels) *both by words and deeds, even as we our selves have been taught and instructed.* The Greek words are these, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες, καὶ πρὸς θεολογίαν μαθεῖν, ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν, ἀρδένως διδάσκοντες; *honouring them both in word and deed; and freely teaching every*

(e) Adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40.

one who desireth to learn those things wherein we been instructed. A little before, he had cited *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, for Prayers to the departed Saints, where he wilfully mistakes that Writers meaning; and what the Counterfeit *Dionysius* speaks of the Prayers of our pious Fellow-Christians here on Earth, applieth to Prayers made to departed Saints; and not only so, but falsifieth his words in more than one place; the passage is this *;

Ἡμεῖς οὖν πάντες ἐν τῇ δὲ τῇ βίῃ τῇ ἁγίᾳ αἱ προσευχαὶ καὶ τὸν δὲ τὸν πόνον, εἰ τις ἱερῶν ἰδιότητος δώρων, — ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τῷ τῷ ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν ἀξιώσειεν αὐτὸν διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς συλλήψεως καὶ συνειδήσεως, ὡφελιδίους πάντως ἐν τούτοις. *This I affirm consonantly to the Scripture; That the prayers of holy men are very useful in this life, this way. If any one desiring the Divine Graces, and be well disposed for the reception of them, shall (as being conscious of his own unworthiness) come to some holy man, and desire him to assist him, and pray together with him, he shall receive hence the greatest benefit.* The words thus justly Translated, do neither favour nor relate to Prayers to the Dead. In the same Column he hath produced some words of *St. Chrysostom* *, with no more ingenuity; for he translates παρακαλῶμεν αὐτάς, *Let us pray to them*; indeed the word ἀξιῶμεν follows, *Let us desire them*, (which yet our Author after his wonted manner exaggerates, *Let us heartily beseech them*): But that this was a meer rhetorical Flight, may be demonstrated beyond all doubt; for in the immediately foregoing sentence he speaks much greater things of their dead Reliques, and Repositories; to which yet even our Author will grant that Prayers are not in a strict and proper sense to be addressed: *In this Fire of Devotion*, saith he, *let us fall down to their Reliques; let us embrace their Repositories; for even the Repositories of Martyrs have great Virtue, as the Bones of Martyrs have great Force.* These Rhetorical Apostrophes are frequent to all Orators, and ought not

* De Ecclesiast.
Hierarch. c. 7.

* Orat. de SS.
Bernic. &
Prosdice.

not to be drawn into Dogmatical Propositions.

I return now to consider our Authors **Columns** separately. The Second is about the Primacy of the Pope, and consists of some Testimonies of the Fathers, which abating the spurious ones, insinuate no more than that *St. Peter* was Prince or First of the Apostles, the Foundation upon which the Church was built, and the Keeper of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; all this we readily acknowledg: None ever denied a Primacy of Order to *St. Peter*; the Scripture assures us that the Apostles were all Foundations of the Church; and our Saviour committed the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to them all: If any of these Testimonies seem to attribute somewhat greater and more eminent to *St. Peter*, we are to consider that Orators seldom contain themselves within the severe bounds of truth, when they set themselves to make an Encomium of any. The Ancients speak no less things of *St. Paul*, and attribute to him no less swelling Titles, as might easily be proved, if our intended brevity would permit it. I will produce only some passages of *St. Chrysostom* *, who calls him *The Tongue of the World, the Light of the Churches, the Foundation of Faith, the Pillar and Ground of Truth, the Vessel of Election, the Temple of God, the Mouth of Christ, the Harp of the Holy Ghost, the Doctor of the World, the Teacher of Divine Opinions, the Schoolmaster of the World, upon whom the eyes of the whole World were cast, and upon whom the care of all the Churches in the World depended; to whose Government God had committed the whole World, to whom the whole World was committed, and all the Churches under the Sun, who governed all the Churches, People, Nations and Cities of the Earth, to whom none can be equalled, who had the Primacy, greater than all others; to Michael was committed the Government of the Jews, but to Paul, the Earth, the Sea, both the habitable, and*

*Hom.inRom.
xvi. 3. in terra
mot.&Laz.
inPaulum.&c.

Hon. ad eos
qui scandalizati
sunt Hom.
de elemos. &
collat.
Τὸ πᾶν τῆς
ᾠκίας τοῦ Παύ-
λου.

inhabitable World, the Illuminator of the World, the greatest of all Men, who alone possessed all the perfections of the other Patriarchs, Apostles, Saints and Martyrs, who is admired and honoured beyond all the other Apostles. None of

* Οὐδὲς γὰρ
ἐν μέλλουσιν
ἴσθις ἵσθ' ὁδῶν.

them was greater than him, yea none was equal to him. I am confident no passages can be found in all Antiquity in

† Lib. de Pudic.

favour of St. Peter, which can equal these produced out of one Author in favour of St. Paul. The most express

passage which our Author alledge, is that of Tertullian†, where he is supposed to call the Pope Chief Pastor, Bi-

* Alix. Differt.
de Script.
Tertul. p. 70.

shop of Bishops, and Blessed Pope. But alas! all these are Ironical Expressions, directed to, not the Pope, but

the Bishop of Carthage, as hath been invincibly proved by a Learned Man, now of our Church. The more express*

Testimonies which remain, are only the first and the last of this Column: The first our Author thought so con-

siderable, that he chose against his usual custom to give it us in Latin: It is part of the Inscription of St. Ignatius's Epistle to the Romans, wherein he calls them the

sanctified and illuminated Church, which presides in the Country of the Romans. These inscriptions of Epistles

were according to the Custom of the Eastern Nations, filled with great and swelling Titles, of which unhappi-

ly this to the Romans was one of the most modest; for he bestows far greater Titles upon other Churches in

some of his Epistles, and particularly calls the Church of the Philadelphians ~~raised~~ raised to the utmost pitch

of perfection; as for the word illuminated, it is a Title which the Ancient Christians bestowed upon all Baptiz-

ed Persons, whom they called ~~sanctified~~ and ~~enlightened~~, as Baptism was commonly called ~~enlightenment~~.

And then for presiding in the Countrey of the Romans, every parti-

cular Episcopal See presideth in her own Diocess; and therefore Ignatius doth not say, which presideth in the

whole World, but which presideth in the Province of

Rome.

Rome: The last Testimony is taken from *Socrates* and *Sozomen* attesting that the Eastern Synods were not valid, unless confirmed by the Pope; that he had a peculiar Privilege of restoring Bishops unjustly deposed, and that to him belonged the care of all the Churches. But first, neither of the Historians affirm, That the Pope had any such privilege which was not common to the other Patriarchs. For it was the constant custom of the Ancient Church, that in all emergent occasions of the Church, the Patriarchs should interpose their judgments, as being more peculiarly obliged to it; by that eminent station which they held among other Bishops: Not that the judgment of every one was authoritative, or immediately put in execution (for their judgments were oft-times contrary) but they thereby only declared what they thought just and Canonical, which if it was not performed, they with the Bishops subject to them, used to deny communion to the other party. Besides, there was a particular reason in the case mentioned by these Historians. For *Athanasius* being deposed by the *Arians*, both Catholicks and *Arians* had submitted the Arbitration of the whole cause to Pope *Julius*. As for the confirmation of Councils; no Council could be General, till approved by all the Patriarchs; & therefore if a Synod were held in the East, where in the *Roman* Patriarch was present, neither by himself, nor by his Legates; no wonder if the Decrees of it obliged not the Western Patriarchate, till confirmed by the Pope. For no more did the Western Synods oblige the Eastern Churches, till confirmed by the Eastern Patriarchs.

The *Fifth Column* treateth of *Transubstantiation*, where in most of the Testimonies produced by our Author, say no more than that the Eucharistical elements after Consecration are the Body and Blood of our Lord. This we also assert and believe; but then the question remaineth still, in what

a) De initan-
dis, cap. 9.

(a) Comm. in
Pfal. 33.

what sense they are the body and blood of Christ; of the remaining citations the most exprefs are those of *Justin Martyr*, *St. Ambrose*, and *St. Augustin*. The first even in the words cited by our Author affirms, That our Flesh and Blood are nourished by the Eucharistical elements; and therefore could not believe Transubstantiation. The Second indeed saith (a) that a preternatural change is made in the elements after Consecration, and the Bread then becomes the Body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, was crucified and buried. But that he means his typical not natural body, is manifest from the beginning of this Chapter, where he compares this heavenly food to *Manna*, or the Bread of Angels; and prefers it because that is subject to corruption, if it be kept from day to day; but this is free from corruption, which whosoever religiously tastes, cannot suffer corruption. From which words, Three several Arguments of a typical sense may be formed. For first, as *Manna* was not truly, but typically the Bread of Angels: So neither is the consecrated Bread truly, but typically the Body of Christ. Secondly, The consecrated elements are as to the matter of them subject to corruption: And therefore *St. Ambrose* believed not the matter of them, but only what they represented, to be the body of Christ Thirdly, He affirms this incorruptible Body of Christ to be received only by the Religious communicant: Whereas if *Transubstantiation*, be true, it is equally received by the most Irreligious person. *St. Augustin* in the place (a) cited by our Author expressly denieth all natural presence. His words are these, *When our Lord Jesus Christ spoke of his Body, He said, Whosoever eateth not my flesh, and drinketh not my blood, shall not have eternal Life: For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. His Disciples, who followed him, were afraid, and scandalized at that speech, and not truly understanding it, thought that our Lord spoke somewhat harsh*

harsh, as if they were to eat that flesh, and drink that blood, which they saw. They could not bear this; as if they had said, How can this be? Error, ignorance and folly had possessed them: Where he goes on to shew that this aversion of the Apostles proceeded from a misapprehension of our Lord's meaning; as if he intended to give them his natural flesh and blood to eat: *Whereas our Lord knew what he meant; he spoke of Sacraments*, or a sacramental presence. This passage sufficiently explains the following Clause cited by our Author, unless we can suppose St. *Augustin* in this obscure sentence to have contradicted the Doctrine by him plainly delivered in the precedent Words.

Sacramenta
prædicabat.

The Sixth Column concerns *Sacramental Confession*, Priestly Absolution and Penance; and in all respects is wholly impertinent; as may appear by these few considerations. First, Then the Church of *England* retaineth and adviseth to her Children Confession, Absolution and Penance; But then she maketh not the first absolutely necessary to Salvation; nor the Second a judicial, but only declaratory act; nor the Third properly satisfactory for sins: Nor do any of the Testimonies produced by our Author, prove these positions. Secondly, The Confession used in the ancient Church was not *Articular*, but publick; not lodged in the breast of the Priest, but made before the whole Congregation. And when afterwards about the time of the *Decian* Persecution these confessions became so numerous, that the Church could not hear them all, a *Pœnitentiarius* was chosen out of the Presbyters to receive them, he did not keep them secret to himself, but only pass judgment which were fit to be made known to the whole Church, and to be performed in the publick Congregation, and which not. 3. Absolution of the Priest was not believed to be judicial or authoritative, and immediately to absolve before God, but only declaratory of the pro-

promises of pardon made by God to all penitent sinners, and to have no other necessary effect, than the restoring of the penitents to the peace of the Church. This may be proved by that very passage of *St. Hierom*, which our Author citeth, where he compareth the Priestly absolution, to the cleansing of Lepers by the Priests under the old Law; a comparison very frequent with the Fathers. For as the *Jewish* Priests made not the Lepers clean, but only declared them so to be, and supposed them to be clean before their declaration; otherwise the declaration would not in the least have contributed to their cleansing: So a sacerdotal Absolution remits not the guilt of sins, but supposeth them to have been before remitted by God, and declareth so to be; otherwise the absolution of a Priest will avail the sinner nothing, nor set him right in the Court of Heaven. 4. Penance in the ancient Church was chiefly intended, not as a satisfaction to God for the violation of his Laws, but as a satisfaction to the Church, for the scandal given to others, and reproach drawn upon the whole Church by the former crimes or irregular practice of the penitents: And therefore was ever augmented or relaxed according to the various exigencies or necessities of times. 5. In the ancient Church, Penance ever preceded Absolution, and was the means of obtaining it: Whereas in the Church of *Rome*, the Penitent is first absolv'd, and then some subsequent Penance is imposed on him: Which takes away the very nature of Penance, Confession and Absolution, as they were used and designed the ancient Christians; and tends only to the interests of the Priest, and delusion of private souls.

The *Seventh Column* undertaketh to prove the lawfulness of *Invocation or Prayer to Saints*, and that they pray for us: the latter we need not deny; but maintain, that that will not warrant the former. So that when all the spurious Testimonies, those which we have

al-

already answered, and those which prove only that the departed Saints pray for us, be expunged; there remain no more than one of *St. Ambrose* (for that of *St. Hierom* is a plain historical Apostrophe) and one of *Theodore*. As for the first, I might justly oppose the authority of some learned men, who maintain this Book *de Viduis*, whence the passage is taken, to be supposititious. But I will content my self to say, That our Author hath falsely translated the place, by rendring *Obsecrandi sunt Angeli pro nobis, ut, &c.* *Obsecrandi sunt Martyres.* We are to desire the assistance of the Angels; we are to pray to the Martyrs: Whereas the words do not in the least insinuate an Exhortation of Prayer to be made to them by us; but only a wish, that they would pray for us, and that we should gratefully accept their charitable kindness in so doing. The Passage || of *Theodore*, as cited by our Author, is a plain forgery. For *Theodore* speaks not one Syllable of praying to the Martyrs; and what our Author translates, *beseech them as Holy men to intercede to God for them*, is no more in the Greek than this, *ὡς ἁγίους αὐτοὺς προσκυνοῦμεν.* We honour, or reverence them as holy men.

|| De curand.
affect. Græc.
Orat. 8.

The last Column treateth of *Purgatory*, and Prayer for the dead. The first we believe to be a Fable, and to have no ground, either in Scripture or Antiquity. The second our Church doth not condemn, only hath prudently omitted it in the publick Service, because it is a thing dubious in it self, and not approved by Scripture. The use of it in the Ancient Church, doth not in the least prove the belief of *Purgatory*. For they anciently prayed for all Saints departed whatsoever, even for the blessed Virgin, Apostles, Martyrs and Confessors; and their Prayers respected not alleviation of freedom from any internal Punishment, but only the day of Judgment, that God would hasten it; and when that comes, receive all departed Souls into the beatifical Vision, which they generally believed was

not bestowed to the departed Saints till the day of Judgment. That Purgatory was anciently believed, our Author's Testimonies do in no wise prove. Some of them indeed mention a purging Fire; But that Fire was not to exist till the Day of Judgment, when all Souls were to pass through it, and to continue a shorter or longer time in it, according to their greater or lesser Purity. No intermediate punishment between Death and Judgment was believed, besides the delay of Resurrection; if that can properly be called a punishment.

There remains only to consider our Author's Catalogue of general Councils: Wherein he hath committed many gross, and, as I fear, wilful mistakes. He makes Pope *Sylvester* preside over the Council of *Nice*; but *Ensebius* and *Socrates*, whom he citeth, say no such thing. *Baronius* indeed saith it: but all the World knows the contrary. For *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba* presided, and subscribed in his own name before the Legates of Pope *Sylvester*. That *Damasus* presided over the first Council of *Constantinople*, is so egregiously false; that that Council was both begun and ended without so much as the knowledge of the Pope, or any other Western Bishops. That *Cyril* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, not Pope *Celestin*, presided over the Council of *Ephesus*, is manifest from the Acts of that Council, from the Commission given to him by the Emperor for that purpose, and from all the Historians of those times. *Cyril* indeed acted for Pope *Celestin*, but not as president, but as one Fellow-Bishop manageth the Proxy of another here in *England*, in the House of Lords. In the Council of *Chalcedon* Pope *Leo's* Legates were so far from presiding, that all the Canons of the Council were made in their absence, and not only without, but against their consent. For when the Legates in the next Session protested against the Canons, they were over-ruled by the Council, and forced

forced to submit. That Pope *Vigilius* presided over the Fifth General Council, or Second of *Constantinople*, is so impudent a Falshood, that it might with equal reason be pretended that *Luther* or *Calvin* presided over the Council of *Trent*: For *Vigilius* who was then at *Constantinople*, gathered an opposite Convention of *Western* Bishops, wherein publishing a long Constitution or Decree in favour of the *Tria Capitula*, he concludes with a severe Censure and Condemnation of all who should hereafter Write, Teach, or Propose any thing contrary to his Decree, which he knew was then in doing in the General Council. The Popes Constitution was read in the Council, and notwithstanding it was Decreed, *Can.* 12, 13, 14. That whosoever defended the *Tria Capitula*, or even did not Anathematize them, should be himself Anathematiz'd. After the Conclusion of the Council, and not till then, *Vigilius* submitted, and writing an Epistle to *Eutychius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who had presided over the Council, professeth he was now very sorry that by the instigation of the Devil he had dissented from the Council, and in contempt of brotherly Charity had openly disagreed from them, and contended with them; that now he was convinced of his Errors, and therefore retracting his former actions, ratified and submitted to the Decrees of the Council. In the Seventh General Council our Author reckoning up the Hereticks condemned by it, as *Paulus*, *Sergius*, *Cyrus*, *Theodosius*, comes off with an &c. the meaning of which may easily be discovered; for this &c. was invented to save the reputation of Pope *Honorius*, who together with the rest was Anathematized by the Council as a notorious and pestilent Heretick. The Second Council of *Nice* was formerly denied to be General by *Theodorus Studites*, altho a great Patron of Image-Worship; and was condemned in the same age by the great Council of *Francfort*. The Fourth Council of

Constantinople in the Year 869 was ever accounted a Schismatical Conventicle by the *Greek Church*. All the following Councils were confined to the *West*, and wanted both the Presence and Suffrage of the *Eastern Patriarchs*, and consequently were not Oecumenical: Many of them are not at this day universally received in the Church of *Rome*; and others are rejected and condemned by the *Gallican Church*, as the First Second, Third, and Fourth of *Lateran*, First, and Second of *Lions*, as to the Constitutions and Canons injurious to the Civil Right of Princes: The Councils of *Florence*, and Fifth of *Lateran*, are wholly rejected by her, and the Council of *Trent* but in part received: Our Author pretendeth, that in the Council of *Florence* the *Greeks* were united to the Church of *Rome*, and subscribed the Union. If a forced compliance of a few Bishops compelled by the threats and force of their Emperor can be call'd an union, this was indeed one: But many of them subscribed for fear of Death, and most for fear of starving, as *Sylvester Sgropulus* an Eye-witness assureth us; and all of them when returning home, were so detested and hated by their Country-men, that they were esteemed worse than Infidels, and not permitted to be buried in holy Ground.

I might make some farther Observations upon our Authors Paper, as why he left that of *Constance* out of the number of *General Councils*; and yet afterwards produced its Authority; how disagreeing the forms of Recantation, prescribed to *Berengarius*, are to the present Belief of the Church of *Rome*, and how little the Testimonies produced by him in favour of Apostolical Traditions, concern the *Romish Doctrine of Traditions*. But what I have already said, is enough to shew that there is a Generation of men in the World, who adding a profound Ignorance to a false Zeal, fear not to sacrifice all considerations of Shame and Honesty, of Truth and Reason, to a present Interest, and the poor advantage of a short-liv'd Imposture.

F I N I S.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

A Dissertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*; more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Bishops of Rome* upon other *Sees*, By *WILLIAM CAVE*, D. D. 8vo.

An Answer to Mr. *Serjeant's* [Sure Footing in Christianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With some other Discourses. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D. D. 4o.

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Answer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. 8vo.

An Abridgment of the History of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. 8vo.

THE APOLOGY of the *Church of England*; and an Epistle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gentleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *JOHN JEWELL* Lord Bishop of *Salisbury*; Made English by a Person of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the said Bishop; Collected and written by the same Hand, 8vo.

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Bishop of *Kilmore in Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which passed betwixt him and *James Waddesworth* (a late Pensioner of the Holy Inquisition of *Sevil*) in Matter of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*. 8vo.

The Decree made at *ROME* the Second of *March*, 1679. condemning some Opinions of the *Jesuits*, and other *Casuits*. 4o.

A Discourse concerning the Necessity of Reformation, with respect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. 4o. First and Second Parts.

A Discourse concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. 4o.

A Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Answer to [A Papist Misrepresented and Represented] 4o.

An Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the several Articles proposed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM*, [in his Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Catholic Church*] 4o.

A Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; against the Exceptions of *Monf. de Meaux*, late Bishop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. 4o.

A CATECHISM explaining the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. With an Answer thereunto. By a Protestant of the *Church of England* 8vo.

A Papist Represented and not Misrepresented, being an Answer to the First, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papist Misrepresented and Represented]; and for a further Vindication of the CATECHISM, truly representing the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. 4o.

The Lay-Christian's Obligation to read the Holy Scriptures. 4o.

The Plain Man's Reply to the *Catholic Missionaries*. 24o.

An Answer to THREE PAPERS lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholic Church* in Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. 4o.

A Vindication of the Answer to THREE PAPERS concerning the Unity and Authority of the *Catholic Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. 4o.

Mr.

B O O K S lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

Mr. *Chillingworth's* Book, called [*The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation*] made more generally useful by omitting Personal Contexts, but inserting whatsoever concerns the common Cause of Protestants, or defends the Church of England, with an exact Table of Contents; and an Addition of some genuine Pieces of Mr. *Chillingworth's* never before printed, viz. against the Infallibility of the Roman Church, Transubstantiation, Tradition, &c. And an Account of what moved the Author to turn Papist, with his Confutation of the said Motives.

The Pillar and Ground of Truth. A Treatise shewing that the Roman Church falsely claims to be *That Church*, and the Pillar of *That Truth*, mentioned by S. Paul in his first Epistle to *Timothy*, Chap. 3. Vers. 15. 4to.

The Peoples Right to read the Holy Scripture Asserted. 4to.

A Short Summary of the principal Controversies between the Church of England and the Church of Rome; being a Vindication of several Protestant Doctrines, in Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intituled, [*Protestancy destitute of Scripture Proofs.*] 4to.

Two Discourses; Of Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead.

An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intituled, [*The Judgment and Doctrine of the Clergy of the Church of England concerning one Special Branch of the King's Prerogative, viz. In dispensing with the Penal Laws.*] 4to.

The Notes of the Church, as laid down by Cardinal *Bellarmin*, examined and confuted. 4to.

Preparation for Death: Being a Letter sent to a young Gentlewoman in France, in a dangerous Dittemper of which she died.

The Difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in opposition to a late Book, Intituled, *An Agreement between the Church of England and Church of Rome.*

A PRIVATE PRATER to be used in Difficult Times.

A True Account of a Conference held about Religion at London, Sept. 29. 1687. between A. *Pulston*, Jesuit, and Tho. *Tenison*, D. D. ss also of that which led to it, and followed after it. 4to.

The Vindication of A. *Cressener*, Schoolmaster in *Long-Acre*, from the Aspersions of A. *Pulston*, Jesuit, Schoolmaster in the *Savoy*, together with some Account of his Discourse with Mr. *Meredith*.

A Discourse shewing that Protestants are on the safer side, notwithstanding the uncharitable judgment of their Adversaries; and that *Their Religion* is the surest Way to Heaven. 4to.

Six Conferences concerning the *Eucharist*. wherein is shewed, that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* overthrows the Proofs of Christian Religion.

A Discourse concerning the Pretended Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*, with an Account of the occasions and beginnings of it in the Western Church. In three Parts; With a Letter to the Vindicator of the Bishop of *Condom*.

The

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

The Pamphlet entituled, *Speculum Ecclesiasticum*, - or an Ecclesiastical Prospective-Glass, considered, in its False Reasonings and Quotations. There are added, by way of Preface, two further Answers, the First, to the Defender of the *Speculum*; the Second to the Half-sheet against the *Six Conferences*.

In the Press.

A *Second Defence* of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, against the new Exceptions of *Monsr de Meaux*, late Bishop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. The **FIRST PART**, in which the Account that has been given of the Bishop of *Meaux's* Exposition, is fully Vindicated; the Distinction of Old and New Popery *Historically* asserted, and the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, in Point of *Image-worship*, more particularly considered. 4^o.

The Incurable Scepticism of the Church of *Rome*. By the Author of the [*Six Conferences concerning the Eucharist*.] 4^o.